

ALEVI PHILOSOPHY



ESAT KORKMAZ

BERSERKER
BOOKS



Esat Korkmaz

Alevi Philosophy

CONTENTS

Alevi Philosophy Alevi Sharia	12
The Adventure of Matter	14
The Adventure of Existence	32
Materialist Sources of Alawite Sharia	46
Anatolia, the Land of Philosophy	51
Anatolian Antiquity	57
Water appeared Water gave birth to everything	58
Air Revealed: Air Created Everything	60
Fire Revealed: All Things Rise from the Fire	62
Soil Revealed: Everything Emerged from the Soil	65
Neo-Platonism	71
Idea vs Form	73
(Thought Generating Thought) God	75
The "Garden" of Metaphysics Neo-Platonism	82
The Neo-Platonists (who defied Jesus)	85
(Dialectic of Good and Evil) Zoroastrian Religion	96
(Philosophy of Relief from Suffering) Buddhism	106
(Religion of Equality, Brotherhood and Happiness) Shamanism	122
Philosophy of Light or Water	127
(Aristotelian) Compromisers	128
(Those who think outside the sphere of belief) Materialists	134
Intuitionist Platonists (those who put reason under the control of intuition)	140
Philosophy of Light or emanation	160
Alawite Sharia is Materialism	179
MindAdventure	186
Alawite Sharia is Enlightenment	199
The Adventure of Tradition and Tradition	203
Alawite Sharia is a Social Ethic	209

ALEVI PHILOSOPHY-ALEVI SHARIA

*"When a person knows where to go
It means that the adventure is closed..."*

Alevi Sharia is a "revolt" against Sunni Sharia, which is structured and shaped on the basis of materialism, guided by reason, and "nourished" by individual and social ethics.

In the philosophical dimension⁹ Alevi Sharia is defined in three ways:

1) A projection of the divine origin or divine

7. Timuçin Afşar; *SonunlulM Emotion in Antoine de Saint-ExupS*
su; Felsefelogos; 2004/3; Bulut Publishing House, pp, 35-37

8. "Philosophy begins with not being satisfied with what is visible, with thinking that what is before us is a world that sometimes requires seeing differently. The visible is our horizon. When we look at what is visible, the limits of this world we are trying to go beyond push us to close our eyes like a horizon. Why do we close our eyes? When we wonder beyond the limits of the visible world, we close our eyes so that our perspective does not make us shallow. By doing so, we imagine the horizon from which the visible begins as another starting point, we try to look at the visible, that is, the world in a different way, to imagine other worlds..." (Camcı, Cihan; *Bülent Annç*, Louis *AmisOong*, *Hız. İbrahim ve Nlirt/er*; Radi- kal Yorum; 15 February 2013; p, 17)

9. "...The word philosophy was originally clearly and unambiguously defined as
'Wisdom
It expressed the attitude of a person who wants to live. Over time, this>>

the visible, perceived as a manifestation of the "essence".
objective social world.

2) Human judgements concerning this objective social world; the results of human reason.

3) Traditions and customs that have their source in this objective social world and are a collective product.

The endeavour must have been too 'simple' for people, because they tried to attribute more and more complex and abstract meanings to the concept, and in the end, what philosophy is became a problem in itself (and an insurmountable one)... You know, there is a tradition of defining human beings by emphasising a characteristic that is not found in animals, a characteristic that is thought to make human beings superior to animals: '*Man is an animal that makes tools*' and so on... I think it is possible, with equal accuracy, to define human beings with the expression '*philosophising animal*'... Philosophy is not a science, and therefore it does not have to work with scientific methods. Philosophy can also be seen as the field where we look at things from a new perspective, where we make the first study of things we come into contact with through our senses or instincts. Philosophy, when viewed in this way, is like a tree on which the sciences are born and mature. As soon as it matures, it separates from the tree of science and continues its development as an independent science... From this point of view, Philosophy seems to be the 'general theory of reality'... So, should philosophy be done in order to turn into Science for the Knowers? Or, as in Spinoza, should Science be done for philosophy? When we meet Spinoza, we realise that philosophy becomes serious and urgent for us. Urgent matters cannot be 'rushed'. The urgency of the matter is this: We have in our hands a great gift, given to us to be experienced only once - and every day we lose a day of it. But unfortunately, there is no instruction manual in the 'gift package'... In Far Eastern thought, philosophical teaching is called 'path'... A reader who is familiar with Eastern thought will realise that Spinoza's thought... is reminiscent of the great systems of thought of India, China and Japan. ..." (Fransez, Moris; *Spinoza'n Tao'bu/Akıfı İfletilifan*) nancın Akıfı, Yol Yayıncılık Tic. Ltd. Şti.; İstanbul- 2004; Preface; pp: 11-22)

THE
"ADVENTURE" OF
SUBSTANCE A

*"Actually, what we read is never determined by chance:
What we read chooses us. "10*

The question of whether nature is "*independent*" of human consciousness has always been the fundamental problem of philosophy: While the materialist conception claimed that "*nature is independent of human consciousness*", the idealist conception considered "*nature to be the product of human consciousness*".

In fact, in a narrow sense, this was a dispute between thinkers. In a broad sense, the masses of the people or a large section of society, far away from this fight, were living a "*spontaneously materialist*" life on the grounds of the assumption that "*nature exists outside of its own self and bones*".

This natural conception on the level of the people or society reached its most adequate philosophical form in "*dialectical materialism*".

According to dialectical materialism, "*the innumerable concrete forms of matter were spontaneously mobile*"; this mobility

10. Dumezil Georges; *Myth and Destnn If Three Functions ideology in the Epics of Indo-European* Halkfarızı (Translation: Ali Berktaş); Yapı Kredi Yayınları; İstanbul- 2012; p.; 9; Introduction/ Three Once Upon a Time-Joel H. Grisward-)

the internal "*correspondence*" of all phenomena and processes in the universe was.

The movement of matter took three main forms:

- a) The way the inorganic world moves;
- b) the mode of motion of the organic world; and
- c) The way society moves.

Matter as a scientific category was a "philosophical *concept*" describing all objective reality that exists independently of consciousness and is perceived by sensations and reflected in consciousness. This definition of dialectical materialism eliminated the "*answers*" arising from the "false" definitions of metaphysics: The conception of matter as an unchanging "*substance*", apart from an infinite variety of concrete forms, was fundamentally "*overthrown*". Contrary to the mathematical conception, matter could neither be "*written*" nor "*destroyed*"; it would constantly "*change*", passing from one state to another. What we call the universe was realised in the historical process of this continuous and infinite change. it's been done.

11. "At the outset, I must say that the text translated by Neylan Eryar is extremely informative and stimulating. It is difficult to address mysterious topics that are always on the agenda without adding to the mystery... It draws the main map: 'alchemy, which has even created a worldview based on the idea that man and nature, spirit and matter are intimately connected', is reviewed from antiquity to the present day... In alchemy, too, material motives are at the forefront in the beginning. After a certain stage, the relationship established with matter and substance shifts to the abstract realm. For this reason, alchemy also has its roots in the ancient contact of mankind with matter. If 'the Greek philosophers endeavoured to form as elegant an abstract idea as possible, rather than to accurately describe the real material world', and if this view took on the character of 'the discovery of nature through practice and experimentation' among the Egyptians, they ultimately converge in the same reason. Material motives determine the method of application as much as the form of abstraction..., in the beginning the basic idea is that gold or silver can actually be produced, not merely imitated.'... Priesner analyses the intellectual process that alchemy went through from stage to stage, and how this process was characterised by magic and mystery. >>>

With the emergence of man, matter revealed a property of matter called "*consciousness*"; for "*consciousness*" was a property of matter. For this reason, it was wrong not *only to "identify"* consciousness with matter, but also to "*sever*" the connection between them.

In the process, consciousness became a "material" force by being organised in the form of "*institutions*"; it influenced and changed society. This influence and change created "*material objects*" such as new means of production and consumption, buildings, machines, etc.

"*Motion*" was a form of existence of matter: Just as there could never and nowhere be "*matter without motion*", there *could* never and nowhere be "*motion without matter*". Matter was the "*object1*" reality communicated to us through our senses; it was infinite and inexhaustible; it would renew our knowledge endlessly and inexhaustibly.

In the historical process, "*materialism has acquired various meanings*" and "*has been called by various names*": Spontaneous Materialism, Living Materialism, Primitive Atomism, Primitive Dialectical Materialism, Ancient Materialism, Atomistic Materialism, Nominalism, Renaissance Atomism, Mechanistic Materialism, XVII. Century Mechanistic Materialism, Encyclopaedists' Materialism, Crude Materialism, Unknowingism, Philosophical Materialism, Dialectical and Historical Materialism.

The author does not hesitate to express the relations and metaphysical connections between alchemy and the polytheistic religion of the Greco-Roman world, and how this understanding 'allowed for the establishment of multifaceted utilitarian relations between gods and human beings', while 'religious belief in Egypt paved the way for practical technological research'. For alchemy has not only been 'in contact with religious mysticism, the arts and the concept of magic' since its inception, but has also had a constant influence of power and force... 'The main concern of this science is to know the change in substances. Islamic civilisation and alchemists have transformed the 'ideal of turning everything into gold', and they have emphasised the phenomenon of the human being. Because every human being, no matter what state and condition he is in, is in fact an accidental gold.'" (Erdem Ömer; İnsan ve Affin/Claus Priesner's *Sim- yadan Kimyaya (From Alchemy to Chemistry)*; Radikal Kitap; 20 April 2012; p. 10)

The first people had a kind of "necessary" spontaneous materialism in their natural understanding of their environment. Again, the first thinkers *naturally* and "necessarily" obeyed the logic of this objective world, which was obvious to man, which was independent of our senses and our ego, and which stood before them without any philosophical endeavour. This was the "*childhood*" period of materialism. The nature that these early thinkers questioned had appeared before them in the form of *matter- se1*". For this reason, this understanding was called "*Natural- Tan'hse1 Materialism*". Since this approach, which emerged as an extension of necessity, did not have a scientific basis in the sense we know it, it could not avoid being "absorbed" into idealism through "*Empiricism*" (Crude Empiricism) and "*Positivism*" (*Positivism*) in the process.

In the extension of this understanding, some thinkers; although they were "*compulsory materialists*" in the narrow sense, they could not help putting forward "idealist" views in general. This idealism of materialist origin was called "*physical idealism*" (physical idealism). Because, in natural and spontaneous materialism, the main thing was "seeing *with the eye*". When the object under scrutiny was lost from sight and turned into a "*mathematical novel*", for the thinker "*devoid*" of dialectical knowledge, "*matter became many*". However, this was a "*cent*"; all the objects that were the subject of study nevertheless "necessarily" recognised their material qualities. Because, all kinds of knowledge about nature indicated the "materiality" of the universe.

For this reason, the Indian, Chinese, Greek-Anatolian scholars of the Ancient Age were "*necessarily*" "*spontaneously materialistic*". Aristotle, who left his mark on the Middle Ages with Platon, summarised the philosophy that preceded him, saying, "Those who first engaged in philosophy asserted that the first basis of all objects was matter alone." Thales, Anaximandros, Anaximenes, Heraclitus and Heraclitus, who preceded Aristotle.

Itos, Anaxagoras, Democritus and Empedocles were materialists.

To the question "*What is existence?*", they always answered "matter".

Ancient Greek-Anatolian materialism spread rapidly in *the "people's fold"* against idealism, the philosophy of slave-owners and aristocrats. Ancient idealism leaned on the "*Greek mythology*" of gods and demigods, which it held to be "*the forces that determine what happens in the world*": Rebellion against the established order of the world was perceived as rebellion against the gods; the "king" representing the ruling class in the established order of the world was sanctified and the symbol of *the "king god"* was created in the mythological hierarchy of gods. This is how idealism, the ruling class philosophy of Antiquity, evolved from polytheism to monotheism.

Since the observation of nature was necessarily of a materialistic nature, every endeavour to know nature found an expanding following among the people or society, who were also necessarily in a "*materialistic conception of life*". For this reason, the Greek-Anatolian materialism of Antiquity, *although it was not able to* completely "*shake off*" the mythological influences imposed by idealism, was able to develop a "materialistic" knowledge of nature that was closely linked to their philosophy.

Heraclitus, who based the universal motion on the "*struggle of opposites*", was the product of such a development. Heraclitus, considered the founder of dialectical materialism, chose "nature" as the subject of knowledge. According to him, man could only know "nature"; *the "supernatural"* was a matter of faith and could not go beyond empty words.

Some thinkers, who were originally materialists, pushed the boundaries of the scientific field and opened a "*door*" to idealism by turning to abstract thematics: The Pythagoreans were among the first representatives of the "*abstract-idealist*" understanding, who jumped into idealism through this door. By addressing the structure of nature, natural materialism rapidly

Anaxagoras, Empedocles and Democritus,

They were the pioneers of "*materialist thought*".

Ancient Greek-Anatolian materialism, passing from there to Rome, gave wide dimensions to the understanding of "*matz- yulism*" that awakened the West centuries later.

In Rome, the homeland of the rule of the powerful and naturally the "*stronghold*" of idealism, Lucretius sowed the "*seeds*" of materialist thought. According to Lucretius, the universe was composed of matter in constant motion; it had no beginning and no end; it was not created and would not perish; time and space could not exist "*outside*" moving matter. It was "*wrong*" and "*false*" to imagine "*scriptural principles*" in explaining nature. In the infinite universe, there were countless worlds. Motion was a property of matter and was not created by any "*flick of an unnatural being*".

There were "*objective laws*" in nature and it developed according to these laws. Thought was a "*reflection*" of objective reality. Our joys and pains were revealed *through our "sensations"*.

According to him, "*spontaneity*" was the fundamental law of the formation of the universe: The atoms of the universe were not "*placed*" in their proper places according to a blueprint prepared by a "*head*"; after undergoing thousands of changes in the universe, after being shaken and displaced in an infinite process, their movements and combinations, after "*trial and error*", finally reached an "*order*" that constituted the universe.

In the Middle Ages, materialism took the form of "*Nounism*" and "*Naturalism*". Both conceptions were "*dualistic*"; they carried a "*materialist*" tendency behind a religious appearance.

"*Nomenclature*", which asserts that general concepts are nothing but the names of objects, indirectly "*denies*" metaphysics by "*denying*" beings independent of objects.

God is not outside of nature, he is not outside of nature.

"*Naturalism*", which says that "*the feminine*" is a principle, is a principle that is applied to objects.

By asserting that there could not be a "*supernatural*"/"*unnatural*" being independent of it, *he* indirectly "*denied*" metaphysics.

Both views are a "*new way of interpreting*" primordial materialism. *rumla*" were the forms that came to life in the Middle Ages.

In the philosophical dimension, the first meaning of the Alevi Sharia was based on this "approach" of the Sufi understanding of "*Wahdat-i Body/Wahdat-i Existence*", which we can call "*Nature-Godism*" or "*Human-Godism*". To say that nature is a manifestation of the divine essence is to accept that there cannot be a "*supernatural*" or "*superhuman*" being outside of objects and, by extension, outside of man. This is another way of describing God in the form of a "*collection*" of objects or people.

As a result, the first definition of the Alevi Sharia was structured on a "materialist" understanding based on the primacy of matter. Pioneering Sufis with a Bâtînî identity carried the materialist values of ancient Greek-Anatolian, Iranian, Central Asian, Indian and Chinese materialism to the ground of Neo-Platonism and moulded them with the Sufi understanding of "U n i t y o f t h e F i r s t" (Wahdat-i Body)/ "*Unity of Existence*" (Wahdat- i Existence). They withdrew the "*inner-conscience*" aspect of Neo-Platonism and emphasised its "*materialist*" aspect. They revived the light of *reason*, which had been "*extinguished*" in the Middle Ages, in Anatolian soil by turning towards physics and nature under the name of "*Philosophy of Light*". This light, which was kept constantly "*awake*" under the "*cover*" of Sufism, was the light that created the Renaissance in the West in the **XVIII**.

It was the Eastern "source" that sustained the Enlightenment of the century. The progressive philosophies of "*Nounism*" and "*Naturalism*" in the Middle Ages were always "*incomplete*" because they were "*devoid of dialectics*" and *could* be "*pulled*" wherever they wanted. They exhibited it.

In the West, "*materialist* philosophy" began to spread rapidly in the XVth century: The development of science and technology led to the development of philosophy.

while materialist philosophy develops science and technology.
du.²

Francis Bacon (1561-1626), the founder of the new materialism, the English empiricist philosophy and the method of logic and induction, said that one could master nature only by acquiring knowledge; in order to attain true knowledge, it was necessary to destroy "*prejudices*", which he called "*idols*"; according to him, knowledge was "*power*"; the book he wanted to read was "*nature*"; nature was nothing but a "*street*". Since he adhered to traditionalist "*understandings*" and was contented with the data of Greek philosophy based on "*abstract concepts*" and Aristotelian logic, he could not reach definite conclusions in the field of science and philosophy. The products of Greek philosophy, with the exception of Democritus and the sages who followed in his footsteps, were not sufficient to "*understand*" nature, since they were not linked to experimentation.

12. "Modernism is a dissolution. The dissolution of the bulk flesh. When did the dissolution begin? Although it is difficult to predict, the process of the emergence of cities rising with trade is decisive. From the 12th century onwards, the words that define these cities in European languages are *bugeis*, *bourg*, *burg*, etc. These are cities secured by du- vars, and at the same time, they are cities that have been able to go beyond the law of feudal areas in a few centuries and establish their own legal order around the market they have. When this shell, the shell corresponding to this incubation period, cracks, a mature class emerges from it: The bourgeoisie. So it is not for nothing that we keep our eyes on these cities... We will touch upon the first Renaissance. The Renaissance coincides with the period when this dissolution has not yet matured enough to establish a cosmology. The old cosmology had collapsed and the world had suddenly turned into a jungle of things in their places. In this universe where there is no criterion for what is possible and what is impossible, everything is now possible... Dissolution finally establishes its own ideology-cosmology in the 17th century. And when it does, that is, when the dissolution is completed and the ideology of the dissolution is established, this 'ideology of equivalence' brings to mind the interchangeability of things." (*ModemlllkYığmsnl Etin Çöz'ul'uş'u*; Felsefe Sosyal Bilirler Der- gisi; 15 July- 15 September 2012; Issue: 17; pp. 2-3)

For Bacon, the only valid power was science; however, science had to be based on "*experimentation*"; it had to be based not on "concepts" but on "*nature*". The problems that science sought solutions to were not in the environment of thought formed by concepts, but in nature recognised by the "*senses*". The aim of science was to dominate nature and its method had to be "*inductive*". However, knowing and approaching nature could only be achieved by grasping the general "*laws*" that regulate it, and the way to achieve this was "*experimentation*". At this point, it would have been misleading to adopt sense data as they were; it was necessary to "*criticise*" them and "*suspect*" them until a definite conclusion was reached.

The Italian physicist Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), a scholar of astronomy and physics, who symbolised the transition from medieval thought to modern observational and experimental science with his "*observations*" and "*experiments*" that started a new era in physics, proved that the Earth "*revolves*" around the Sun.

13. "At the beginning of the XVIIth century in Europe, there was a significant change in the human view of nature. The Aristotelian view of nature, which had been dominant until then, was replaced by a new perspective. Although Galileo's name is given to this new perspective (...), it is undeniable that Descartes also made a great contribution. The main innovations were the following: 1) The mathematisation or geometrisation of physics. Galileo wrote: *'Philosophy is the software in that great addressed universe, which is open before us in an endlessly open way. But one cannot understand this book until one has learnt to decipher its language and to read the letters that compose it. The book is written in the language of mathematics and its letters are triangles, circles and other geometrical figures...'* 2) The replacement of Aristotle's view of nature as a kind of organism animated by an impulse that drives it towards a natural end by a new view. According to the new view, nature functioned more like a machine or a clock than an organism. 3) The tendency to replace Aristotle's fragmentary explanations with general theories. 4) A world view that takes into account the possibility that the world may be very different from what we perceive, instead of Aristotle's view that relies on the senses. 5) To give priority to experimental observations to be made with greater and greater rigour..." (Fransez, Moris; *Spinoza* Tao sNAkılfi brian@an İrian@ Akla; Yol Yayın- cıLk Tic. Ltd. Şti.; İstanbul- 2004; pp. 119-120)

ney and eyes" as the only method. He explained for the first time *the "S'utturUm JasaSIn and its connection"*; he not only asserted, but also proved to a great extent, *the "infinity" of matter*. Regardless of Aristotelian physics, which had been dominant since the IV century B.C., and the philosophical teachings and church dogmas that were the common denominator, Galilei gave birth to the *"original imagination"* that believed in the truth that only *"observation and experiment"* could verify.

The English thinker Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) argued that the soul did not exist as a *"creative"* substance and that the only substance was *"material objects"*. According to him, there could be no innate knowledge; knowledge could only be acquired through *"experiment and observation"*. He established a semi-analytical, semi-synthetic scientific method by *"combining"* induction with deduction. According to Hobbes, philosophy was science itself; there was *"no place"* for theology in philosophy; the subject of philosophy was *objects*. The universe was made up of *"ti- bald"* objects; concepts were *"universals"*, they were nothing but *the "determinability" of determined particulars*. The method was the shortest way to find effects from known *"causes"* or causes *from known "effects"*. In this context, causes were determined as *the "collection" of necessary and sufficient conditions*. The universe was composed of *"matter and motion"*; there was no existence other than *"moving" matter*.

The French physicist Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655), who tried to emphasise a moderate *"scepticism"*, revived *"Lucretiusian materialism"*. He defended the concept of *"atomistic materialism"* and argued for *"objectivity", "non-creation" and "indestructibility"*. Modern science, scepticism and atomism were the three main sources that influenced Gassendi's thoughts. According to him, nature itself was not perceived, but only *its "appearance"*; the only knowledge that enabled the perception of the universe and whose veracity did not need to be doubted was *"limited knowledge"*. *"Restricted knowledge"* was the only knowledge that could be attained.

For this purpose, it was first necessary to accept "*perception*" and then the existence of "*external objects*" brought about by perception. Phenomena that could not be grasped directly by the senses were also grasped by "*images*" found in the senses. This way was through "*applying reason to experiment*"; events that could not be directly grasped by experiment were brought to consciousness by "*reason*".

The universe was composed of indivisible "*atoms*" and these atoms were in constant "*movement*" in empty space. Atoms of different sizes and shapes came together to form "*objects*"; all changes in the universe were due to the displacement of atoms, that is, to their movement.

Gassendi, who could not save himself from the "*Aristotelian understanding*" despite reviving Atomist Materialism, argued that the first movement of atoms was given by "*God*".

The Englishman John Locke (1632-1704), who was the "*pioneer*" of the Enlightenment and whose ideas inspired the US Constitution, argued that the only source of knowledge was "*experiment and sensation*" and that the human brain without knowledge would be nothing but an "*empty le- rha*", which he called "*tabula ra- sa*". According to him, the human faculty of understanding had no "pre-determined" content. The mind of a newborn child was devoid of ready-made concepts and ideas". Man was born with only the ability to "*acquire knowledge*". The mind, which was initially a blank sheet of paper (*tabula rasa*), was gradually filled with the individual "*ideas*" that the senses took from the external world. When the mind's relationship with ideas reached a certain "*intensity*", they were placed in the "*memory*" and their names were spoken. Ideas and their names in the mind constituted experience and the human ability to speak, that is, "*language*". Later on, ideas were combined in various forms to create complex ideas, and the propositions and judgements based on these ideas formed human knowledge of "*reality*".

All these thinkers were able to achieve "*dialectical thought*".

they had not: They "*necessarily*" had to base their philosophy on "*mechanics and mathematics*", which were developing very rapidly in their time.

The "*mechanistic theology*" of the French thinker Rene Descartes (1596-1650) and the great discoveries of the Englishman Isaac Newton (1642-1727) in the field of "*mechanics*" greatly influenced the "*materialism*" of the XVIIth-XVIIIth centuries. This influence brought along an "*illusion*": The "*delusion*" that the life of nature and society could be explained by the "*laws of mechanics*" became widespread. On the basis of this prevalence, an understanding called "*Mechanistic Materialism*" was born. According to this understanding, movement was only a "*displacement*" event. As a necessity of this understanding, mechanistic materialists tried to explain nature and society with this "*displacement*" movement. For this reason, the English and French materialism of the XVH.-XVIII. centuries remained entirely within a "*mechanistic materialist*" understanding.

Nevertheless, the mechanistic understanding "*refuted*" the theological designs on the subject of motion to a considerable extent. The Englishman Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), in defence of "*scientific necessitarianism*", opposed "Cadetism" and showed that "*thinking and feeling*" were "products" of different forms of matter.

The Irish John Toland (1670-1722), who argued for the establishment of a "*religion*" based on the principles of reason and stemming from a materialist understanding, defended "*free thought*", proved that the institution called religion was born out of "*socio-economic conditions*"; and developed the theory of the "*unity of matter and motion*": According to him, the establishment of an order of belief based on a materialist philosophy and guiding life was inevitable in order to "*rescue*" man from the impasse of thought in which he found himself: For this purpose, he presented a belief in "*religion*" free from "*myths and mysteries*"; he argued that an institution of faith which is "*incompatible*" with the principles of reason and which claims to be "*superior*" to reason cannot be "*educational and developmental*". Because, in-

The human spirit *would not "believe" in what it did not "understand"*. The teaching of Jesus was true, but the Gospels lacked *the "believable content"*. The idea of spiritual immortality originated in Egyptian polytheism. And this was a consequence *of the "veneration"* of the dead. In the following period, this *"respect"*, which took on the character of a *"belief"*, became one of the basic characteristics of monotheistic religions. An objective being is not in a *"formal stasis"*. was: Every movement is *"passive"* in relation to the concrete object that pushes it, and *"efficacious"* in relation to the object that creates a change of position. That is to say;

a) In the first position, it was the separate object that created the movement; accordingly, the movement was the product of the object.

b) In the second position, the movement was the cause of a new phenomenon because it changed the position of a n o t h e r object.

The Frenchman Denis Diderot (1713-1784), who developed an *"experimentalist-materialist"* philosophy and pioneered the idea of the evolution of species, waged war against *"feudal-religious ideology"* and made the transition *from "deism and moralism" to materialism*. Diderot, who favoured *the "evolutionary correlation"* between natural processes, saw the infinite changes of form in nature; in order to explain *the "correlation"* between material movement and sensation, he took up the concept of *"sensibility of matter"*; he tried to prove that secondary qualities were also *"objective"*. According to him, the universe recognised by human senses was a *"physical, material"* system. Matter, by virtue of its essential or necessary nature, moved in *"circular"* motion. For this reason, every aspect and every part of the universe was in constant *"change and movement"*.

Claude Adrien Helvetius (1715-), a Frenchman who argued that people are *"equal"* at birth in terms of their moral faculties, that subsequent differences arise from environmental and educational conditions, and who interpreted *"hedonism"* in a physical sense.

1771); he developed "*sensationalism*" which was purified from intellectualism: He demonstrated the important role of the social environment in human development; he argued that human intelligence is "*differentiated*" by the effects of the social environment. Helvetius, who thought that all knowledge came from the senses, called this faculty "*physical senses*". According to him, everything related to the instant and the instant was based on and explained by this faculty. Just as all knowledge content came from sensation, he found the source of all affections and passions in the sensuous elements of "*pleasure and purity*". Passions, on the other hand, were the source of all action; a person whose passions were "at rest" was "apfaZ".

Paul Dietrich d'Holbach (1723- 1789), a French philosopher of German origin, who also propagated "*godlessness*" with a materialist view, argued that religious thought was caused by "*ignorance*"; that human sensations were "*brought into existence*" by the influence of matter composed of atoms, *that* matter could not be separated from motion; that man was a part of nature and was bound by "*natural laws*". According to him, nature had to be accepted "*as it is*" with all its beauty, cruelty, limitations and possibilities. Nature constituted the whole being; there was nothing *but* "*matter and motion*" in it. Man, with his spiritual and moral life, was nothing but matter and movement. The principle of matter, which took different forms and appearances, was "*movement*"; movement not only changed the material being, but also created "*new and other material beings*" out of it. The soul had no existence of its own; it was nothing but the "activity" of the body as an organised whole.

These thinkers, who were basically "*materialists*", could not save themselves from "*metaphysical fallacies*" because they were "*devoid*" of dialectics. We can categorise these misconceptions under three headings:

- 1) Because they have a mechanistic understanding, all movement-reduced ket forms to mechanical movement; organic

They could not understand the characteristics of nature and the specific laws of social life.

2) Because they had an idealistic understanding, they could not apply their teachings to social life.

3) Because they were attached to the metaphysical method of thinking, they thought that nature was unchanging; they could not explain the development of nature.

The materialist understanding, which came to life in England and France in the XVIIth-XVIIIth centuries, developed in Germany and Russia in the XIXth century. "*Scientific materialism*" was a product of the "transcendence" of idealism and crude materialism by connecting them to scientific laws.

The idealism of the German Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770)- (1831) contained all the elements of scientific materialism, albeit in an "*inverted*" form. For Hegel, dialectics was not only the law of the imagination, but also the law of nature: Everything, from the insect on the ground to the gilding in the sky, developed *through* dialectical "*transcendence of contradictions*". Hegel's dialectics was both a "*law*" and a *method*": In other words, dialectics could again be grasped "*dialectically*". Hegel's problem stemmed from the fact that he conceived dialectics with a "metaphysical way of *thinking*"; for this reason he remained "necessarily idealist"; he could not realise in action what he said in theory.⁴

Another thinker based on Hegel is Ludwig

14. "Hegel is an important theorist of tragedy who endeavours to rescue the depth, seriousness and intensity of tragedy from sentimentalist dilutions, but at the same time to reconcile it with Enlightenment Reason. In this case, the important tragic philosopher of the counter-Enlightenment is Nietzsche, who shares Kierkegaard's hatred of rationalism with a pagan rather than a Protestant point of view. For Anna Nietzsche, tragedy is a kind of philosophical theology, or, as in Hegel, a defence of evil... For Nietzsche, tragedy is the highest criticism of modernity, which is one reason why the subject occupies an important place in a mediocre age in terms of tragic art. Tragedy is myth against science, morality against >>>

Feuerbach (1804-1872). According to Feuerbach, who put forward the concept of "*anthropological materialism*", the basis of the structure of existence was "*matter*", but he himself was "*thought*". He saw man as the most superior being of nature and tried to explain human qualities with their "*natural sources*". He approached the human being from a life-long perspective and analysed the abstract human being "*spatially*" as a subject of philosophy. For this reason Feuerbach's anthropological materialism was also called "*philosophical materialism*".

XIXth-century materialism Russian and Eastern European thinkers-

'life' versus 'life', music versus discourse, anteriority-infinity versus progress, ecstasy from pain versus a naïve humanitarianism, **heroism** versus mediocrity, ... is a matter of..." (Eagleton, Terry; *Tatls Violence / Tra- jik Kawans-* Translation: Kutlu Tunca-; Istanbul-2012; p. 86)

15. "God is the love that fulfils our desires, the needs of our emotional world. God is the *realised desire* of the heart. God is ... the prayer that listens to itself, the *world of feeling* that realises itself, the echo of the voices we make out of pain. Pain has to express itself; the singer reluctantly picks up the instrument to give life to his notes with his own pain. He satisfies his pain by observing it, by materialising it; he alleviates the burden that compresses his body by transmitting it to the air, by dispersing it, by making his pain a general essence. But it does not hear man's complaints, it is insensitive to his pain. For this reason, man turns away from nature, from visible objects in general, and returns to himself, where he tries to find someone who will listen to his pain in secret and hidden from the insensitive forces. It is here that he reveals the secrets that overwhelm him, here that he relieves his trapped heart. This *relief* of the heart, this *outward* secret, this transferred spiritual anguish is *ranrz*. God is the tear of love shed in great secrecy over human misery...; prayer is the unconditional confidence of the human world of feeling in the absolute *identity* of the essential and the objective; it is the certainty that the power of the heart is greater than the power of nature, that the need of the heart is *the omnipotent necessity*, the destiny of the universe. Prayer changes the course of nature; prayer determines God to bring about an outcome *that develops* according to the laws of *nature*. Prayer is the *behaviour of the human being towards himself, towards his own essence*. ... Prayer is the division of the human being *into two essences*; it is speaking to oneself with one's heart. It is necessary for prayer to be expressed... out loud... for it to be effective. Prayer is an involuntary >>>

developed by others: Mikhail Vasil'yevich Lomonosov (1711-1765), who made important contributions to natural sciences and is considered the founder of Russian materialism, developed a kind of "*atomistic materialism*" by arguing that the origin of beings is "*nature*". By proving that heat arises from motion, he opposed the theory of "*innate thought*" and turned to the sensory and natural sources of thought.

Aleksander Radishchev (1749-1802), who followed him and pioneered the spread of revolutionary ideas and the adoption of materialist philosophy, opposed the "immortality" of the soul with materialist views. According to him, what was real was "*material*", and metaphysical and idealist philosophy could not grasp the truth because it did not rely on "*sense data*".

Vissarion Grigoryevich Belinsky (1811-1848), who emphasised the importance of social influences in art and defended a realistic literature, argued that the intellectual "*arises*" from the physical and defended the "*objectivity*" of social laws. However, all these thinkers were generally in favour of "*crude materialism*".

/isf⁶: Identification of consciousness with matter; philosophical problem-

it comes out of the mouth easily; the pressure of the heart breaks the lock of the mouth... Prayer itself is the concentration of attention, the elimination of all distracting designs, of all disturbing influences from without, the turning inwards to be alone with one's own essence..." (Feuerbach, Ludwig; *The Essence of Christianity*. -Trans: Oğuz Özügöl; Say Yayınları; İstanbul- 2008; p, 171-177); "The conscious negation of religion constitutes the basis for the necessity of a new epoch, a new, open-hearted, no longer religious philosophy, a philosophy absolutely opposed to Christianity. Philosophy replaces religion, but in this way a completely different philosophy also replaces the old philosophies. Philosophy up to today could not replace religion; it was philosophy, but it was not religion, it had no religion. It left the very essence of religion outside itself, it defended religion only as a form of thought..." (Feuerbach Ludwig; *Geleceğin -eJsefesi* -Trans: Oğuz Özügöl; Say Publications; Third edition; İstanbul- 2012; p: 64)

16. "Adorno and Horkheimer are opposed to crude materialism, which separates subject and object as absolute, and to metaphysics, which is based on the identity of the two. However, they reject neither materialism nor metaphysics. >>

"*samu- ci qualities*", such as trying to analyse their phenomena through concrete research, simplifying the basic principles of materialism, considering consciousness and social phenomena as the result of physiological processes, and appearing as a phenomenological reaction against idealism, again fed their "illusions."⁷

Scientific materialism is a concept that transcends all these misconceptions.

It is "*dialectical and historical materialism*" that determines the objective laws of society as well as of society. The "*dialectical and historical materialism*" constructed by Marx and Engels in the second half of the 19th century enlightened the social-historical process and revealed the laws of the development of society. Diya-

In dialectics, according to them, there is room for both. They find the basis for this in Marx's 1844 Manuscripts: 'Thought and being are really distinct, but at the same time they are in unity.' As Orhan Ko- çak emphasises, 'Marx had first criticised Hegel's idealism, saying that what is called consciousness is human consciousness and that it takes place in social reality as a part of it. In other words, consciousness was the consciousness of people, but being was conscious social being.'" ((Dellaloğlu Besim F.; *An Introduction: Adomo Yûz Yaşında*; Adomo: Kitle, Melankoli, Felsefe; Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p, 18)

17. "God is not a supernatural being, but in reality *a projection* by man of the best elements of his own nature. God is the true *revelation* of man, but he dominates him and is in reality his alienation.

Feuerbach was therefore taking from Hegel the process of alienation, but reversing it. Man objectifies his essential nature in objects outside himself. But in revealing itself, it not only creates objects; these objects become independent, alien, oppose and dominate it. Man realises his own richness in God.

. externalised in God, and the more he enriched God, the poorer he himself became." (Marx Karl; *1844 EI YdZmalan/ Economy, Politics and Philosophy* -Trans: Kenan Somer; Sol Yayınları; Fourth edition; Anka- ra- 2011; E. Bottigelli; Presentation; p, 23)

The method of "*dialectical* and historical materialism" was "*dialectical*" in its approach to nature and its understanding of it. As a consequence of this;

1) Contrary to metaphysics, he saw nature not as a random accumulation of objects and events, but as a whole of objects and events that are organically connected and dependent on each other.

2) Contrary to metaphysics, he argued that nature was not in a state of inactivity and immutability, but in a process of change, renewal and development.

3) Contrary to metaphysics, he argued that the process of development is not a simple process of growth, but a process of leaps from quantitative changes to qualitative changes.

4) Contrary to metaphysics, it argued that development takes place by following a spiral development from the bottom to the top, and that it arises from the contradictions in the essence of objects and events.

Dialectical and historical materialism was "materialist". It was "materialist".
as a requirement;

1) Contrary to idealism, he asserted the primacy and independence of matter from consciousness, that moving events are different forms of moving matter, that the dependence and dependence of events and objects are due to the law of the development of matter, and that universal development occurs according to this law.

2) Contrary to idealism, he argued that the universe and its laws could be known, and that the process of knowledge would be verified in practice by universal life and would develop indefinitely.

Varlığın "Serüveni"

"When someone interrogates you, if he asks about being, answer with non-being. If he asks you about non-being, answer with being.

If he asks you a question about the common man,
"Answer by speaking of the wise, etc."

"Everything that exists independently of consciousness" is perceived as existence. The first philosophical thinker to use the term "existence" in the philosophical sense was Parmenides (540 BC-?), the founder of the "Elea School", who argued that there was only "One Being" and that change was an "illusion" caused by the senses; according to him, only "monotheism" existed, only "monotheism" was realistic, and changes were nothing but "appearances".

Therefore, changes and multiplicity were "illusion". Existence was "one" and did not change. Changes and multiplications, which were nothing but illusions, were also peculiar to "existents", which were "images" and "illusions".

For example, white flower, white stone, etc. exist concretely.

whereas "whiteness" "did not exist" anywhere and at any time, i.e. "abstract".

This was also the case with "existence/zk" against those who existed: The real truth was not the "existent" or the "existent", but the "non-existent", that is, the "existent".

The "vor- found" do not exist in reality, whereas the "v-

18. Barthes, Roland; *Empire of Signs* (Translation: Tahsin Yücel); Yapı Kredi Publications; 2nd Edition; İstanbul- 2008; p, 75

19. "Since non-being and being emerge from a single foundation, they are distinguished from each other only by their names. The name of this single foundation is Darkness. -To darken this darkness, that is the door to all sorts of tansans" (Tao Tö King)/ (Roland Barthes; *Parts of a Love Discourse* (Translation: Tahsin Yücel); Metis Publications; İstanbul- 1992; footnote on p, 158)

he "*metaphysical and idealist view*" that "*what does not exist*" is real and exists was formulated by Parmenides of Elea. Parmenides said the following: "Although we perceive with our senses images and multiplicities that are not real but images, we comprehend the unchanging and unique reality with our *intellect*, not with our senses. What is sensed is "a/- *sensational*", the real reality is that which is grasped by thought and reason.

Parmenides, an important thinker of metaphysics and idealism, could not completely free himself from the "*materialist*" siege of the First Age; he asserted that existence is in the form of "*what exists*" and has a place in space. This meant, albeit indirectly, that existence was "*material*". Parmenides' doctrine is based on two basic concepts, one being "*true*" and the other being "*sam*". Man can adopt one of these two paths; either he goes to "*truth*", "*reality*" or to "*falsehood*", "*error*". The person who takes the "*right*" path is confronted with the problem of "*existence*". Existence is "*One*"; it is imperishable; it is unchanging; it is not created; it is a self-contained, continuous whole. To assert that this "*One*" is created means to derive it from "Yar/tüh 'YoHuk". This is a contradiction, for it is impossible for a "Creator" to be born from "Nothing".

"*Condensation and dilation*" is a change; it is a transition from one state to another. An object is divided into sections; the sections merge among themselves; if the merger is frequent, it leads to "*condensation*"; if it is infrequent, it leads to "*dilation*". However, since "*Being*", which is one, is not divided, such an event is out of the question. The knowledge claimed to be provided by the senses is deceptive; because the senses show that objects are in a "*constant change*"; they arouse the "*belief*" that there are many different types of existence. However, since what exists is "*One*", change and transformation are not real, but "*illusion*". "*Assuming*" existence is the source of error. For this reason, leaving "*experiment*" aside, only

"It is necessary to think of *the* Creator; this is the sure way to reach true knowledge. The person who wants to grasp the truth must not depend on the eye, ear, but on "reason" (logos).

Parmenides' view that "*there is only One; Being is One; diversity and change are illusions of the senses*" gradually led to the solution of philosophical problems on the basis of concepts, to a *method*".

His theory, which adopted "*D'is'ago*" as the fundamental principle of existence, "*contributed*" to the development of theology; after the emergence of monotheistic religions, it "*strengthened*" the belief that all types of existence originate from God. Anatolian theology, which sees God as the only being and the universe as His reflection indirectly "*nurtured*" mysticism.

Plato, the second great thinker of metaphysics and idealism, argued that the senses give us no knowledge and that knowledge is purely "*conceptual*", that is, "rational".

For example, when we analyse the problem of "chill", Plato answers "*what does chill mean?*" as follows: We can know it to the extent that we can distinguish it from warmth, itching, flushing, that is, to the extent that we can classify it *with "concepts"*. Similarly, we can know "*who is the "cold" member?*" to the extent that we can distinguish our own body from other bodies, animals, plants, etc., that is, to the extent that we can classify them *with "concepts"*.

Since we learn this knowledge as "*conceptual*", that is, as "axiological", Plato said that reality is not "*individual*" but "*universal*", that is, it is not "*existent*" but "*non-existent*". He also called "idea" the reality that exists universally (existence) but does not exist individually (existence).²⁰

20. "Plato's classical ontology, called "*Platonist1 f''*", does not benefit from the proposals of the post-Elean philosophies on the subjects of being and change; it considers them outside its field of interest; it goes directly to Parmenides. >>

Plato, like Parmenides, was finally forced to accept the existence of a "drying" substance: "Ideas", he argued, lived in a "house of ideas", that is, in a certain place, and "ascended rufiJar" could go and see them. In fact, Plato had to solve the "dilemma" of his system by stepping into a materialist channel; in order for individual existence to come into being, he had to reach a "formless raw material" that the Idea could mould.^o

Aristotle, the third great thinker of metaphysics and idealism, opposed Platon, arguing that "t'umels cannot have existence". According to him, "whiteness" existed in white flowers and white stones, but there was no such thing as "whiteness" outside of them. The universal was "real", but real

and tries to follow Him. On the other hand, Plato embraced Parmenides as well as his opponents, namely Heraclitus and Pythagoras. Plato's mastery and greatness unites these three mutually exclusive philosophies by applying them to different fields without causing a dead end, to such an extent that his philosophy finally gains the appearance of a comprehensive and original system."(Korkmaz, Esat; Alevilik ve Belctasilik Terimleri Sözlüğü; Anahtar Kitaplar yaymevi; Expanded Fourth Edition; İstanbul- 2005; p, 334); "Nietzsche's philosophy, according to his own testimony, is inverted Platonism... For Plato, the supersensible is the real world. It stands above as the giver of measure. The sensible world stands below as the visible world. That which is above is from the beginning and by itself the giver of measure and therefore desirable. After the reversal -...- the sensory, the visible world lies above and the supersensory, the real world, lies below..." (Heidegger Martin; Nietzsche's Platonism Reversed (Translation: Oruç Aruoba); Cogito; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Ya- pı Kredi Yayınları; İstanbul- 2001; Issue: 25; s, 135)

21. "Nevertheless, as stated, the idea of the highest good is unacceptable, for it is an insult to reason that it is outside of the means (God and the immortality of the soul) and outside of any kind of sensuality." (Bernstein J.M.; Why Get Rid of Appearances? Meta izik Experience and the Possibility of Ethics (Translation: Kemal Atakay) Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; pp: 216)

universals did not exist; what existed was not universal, but *"individual"*.

Aristotle, too, could not escape the search for a *"first substance"*: he had to find a *"raw material"* that could be formed by his *"form"*, which he substituted for Plato's *"idea"*. In essence, to the extent that Aristotle regarded *"existence"* as dependent on *"existence"*, that is, *"universal, form"*, he also regarded matter as *"dependent"*. For it was another way of saying that *"without form, individual existences would not exist"*.

Parmenides was the centre of Platonic and Aristotelian thought. Their greatest contribution to the metaphysics and idealism that dominated the age is the judgement that *"the universal (existence) that is real is not real, and the individual (existence) that is real is not real"*. On the other hand, the same thinkers, despite all religious *"pressures"*, made *"progressive contributions"* to the concept of *"existence"*, which medieval materialism in general and Anatolian batinism in particular had chosen as a stepping stone for their view of the universe: According to them, *"existences"* could only *"exist"* in dependence on *"VdYf1 d"*. Naturally, *"existence"* was not dependent on any ties, but on itself. In other words, *"existence"* was intellectual and rational; it could not be perceived by the senses. After all, *"existence"* meant *"ta22T1"*.

Anatolian Batinism structured its materialism, which came to the fore as the dominant understanding in its philosophy, on the *"progressive contributions"* given to the concept of *"existence"* in the Middle Ages, with the interpretation of *"Unity of Being"*.

From the Middle Ages until the second half of the nineteenth century, the concept of *"fortune"* generally continued this basic *"idealist"* conception from antiquity: In particular, three thinkers stood out: the French thinker Descartes, the English thinker Berkeley and the German thinker Hegel.

Descartes, who founded *"rationality"* and *"dualism"*, who formalised *"analytical thought"* and laid the foundations of *"analytical geometry"*; Descartes, who said, *"I exist because I think"*, defined existence in terms of the individual.

He linked it to a personal and subjective thought (*subjective idealism*). Thus, Descartes arrived at a "proposition", the truth of which cannot be doubted: "man exists as an imaginative being". Although knowing that he existed was "necessary" for establishing other knowledge, it was not "sufficient". For this reason, man had an "idea" of God. This "idea" was the idea of a "competent" and "unquestionable" being in the *absolute* sense. In terms of their sources, ideas were divided into three:

- a) Ideas that come from nothing or from outside;
- b) Ideas produced by human beings and
- c) Ideas that are innate.

Descartes, who seeks an answer to the question "*From which of these sources did the idea of God come?*" through "*reasoning*", adds that if man has the idea of an infinite being, he cannot have "produced" this idea, because man is "*finite*". Nor can it "*come*" from nothing or from outside; therefore, it must be "*innate*", it must be implanted in the human understanding by an "*infinite being*", he adds. According to him, therefore, the existence of God, an infinite being, was "necessary"; the proposition that God exists was as "*self-evident*" and "*beyond doubt*" as the proposition that man exists.

Berkeley (1685-1753), on the contrary to metaphysicians and idealists, used existence in the sense of "being" when he said "*existence is not perceived*". According to him, there were two ways of existence: Either "*perceived*" or "*perceiving*". A perceived being required a perceiving being to "exist", and a perceiving being required a perceived being to "exist":

- a) Perceived beings are sensible objects and qualities, i.e., ideas; the passive principle:
- b) The perceiving beings were the mind or soul, the active principle.

Thus, says Berkeley, ideas and the beings that perceive them Spirits can "exist". Spirits cannot be perceived because they are not "passive"; they cannot be known directly by "experiment". The only way to know spirits is to perceive the "result" of their activities. Since an "infinite" spirit perceived objects that no "finite" spirit perceived, there was a "continuous existence" of objects. This meant that God's existence as "an infinite mind, a spirit" was "recognised".

was in a state of "nirvana".

According to Hegel, "being" was the first and only category that could explain the universe: For example, he said, "if I were to abstract all the existences in the universe one by one, I would be left with only being". Existence was "the only thing common to all existence" and was the highest abstraction. Therefore, being was "universal" and, since it was universal, it was "objective". It was objective but had "no existence". With this assertion Hegel brought objective ideology to its climax."

In scientific language, existence exists "independently" of consciousness
"material universe", which is the "material universe".

22. "Adomo and Horkheimer are opposed to crude materialism, which separates subject and object as absolute, and to metaphysics, which is based on the identity of the two. However, they reject neither materialism nor metaphysics. According to them, there is room for both in dialectics. They find the basis for this in Marx's 1844 fiJyazmalan: 'Thought and being are really separate from each other, but at the same time they are in unity.' As Orhan Koçak emphasises, 'Marx firstly criticised Hegel's idealism and stated that what is called consciousness is human consciousness and that it takes place in social reality as a part of it, and in a second step he criticised Feurbach's philosophical materialism and stated that the object of philosophy is human and social reality and not an abstract natural entity. In other words, consciousness was the consciousness of people, but being was the conscious social being.'"(Dellaloğlu Besim F.; *An Introduction: Adomo in the Age of Crisis*; Adomo: Kitle, Melankoli, Felsefe; Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p, 18)

idealism, which sees consciousness as the product of consciousness, and crude materialism, which sees consciousness as the product of being, have been "overcome".

Science has given its definitive answer to the question of the *"relation"* between consciousness and being, or between the spiritual and the material: Existence is *"primary"*, consciousness is *"secondary"*; the *"material universe"* was formed first, and consciousness emerged at a certain *"stage of development"*. However, consciousness is not a *"passive"* reflection of existence, but an *"acquiring"* force that affects it.

Aristotle called *"ontology"* the science that *"prioritises things as they exist"*. In the Middle Ages, Thomas of Aquino (1225-1274), who reinterpreted Aristotle's doctrine of the separation of reason and belief, and that an object that is known is not an object that is believed, defined ontology as *"the knowledge of the beings created by God"*. He made extensive use of Aristotelian mathematical physics in order to create a *"Gelse- n ground"* for Catholic dogmas. The focus of Thomas' philosophy is the *"connection"* between reason and faith: According to him, reason is an important faculty, but it is *"limited"* and not capable of *"solving"* the problems of theology. It requires a higher level of cognising faculty that transcends the limits of reason; this faculty is *"faith"*. Therefore, reason can function *"under the control of faith"*; a reason devoid of faith was *"inefficient"*.

The science of the highest-tier field of being is *"ontology"*, ontology is the source of all sciences and is based on *"self-evident principles"*. These principles are the laws of logic, ontology and the faculty of thinking, which are of general validity:

- a) Non-contradiction;
- b) The whole is greater than its parts and
- c) Every effect has a cause,

These propositions, which are expressed in the form of
It is found both in "*self*" and in "*thought*".

The truth and certainty of these three laws do not require a "*definition*". In every object, the "*essence*" which declares what that object is, what kind of quality it has, and the "*element*" which shows its existence are distinct: in God, on the other hand, "*we*" and "*existence*" are one.

Christian Wolff (1679-1754), one of the pioneers of German Enlightenment philosophy in the 17th century, defined "*ontology*" as the science of fundamental principles and set out to analyse the basic structure, types and forms of a "*sensible, immaterial*" existence. Wolff's teaching, based on the principles of reason, had two basic ideas:

- 1) Providing precise and clear information free from all kinds of doubts;
- 2) Philosophy's endeavour to guide life and lead people to happiness.

According to him, "*all knowledge*" can be gained by deductive method and by relying on the principle of non-contradiction; "the principle of non-contradiction" was the fundamental law not only of healthy thinking but also of all types of existence, including the "principle of sufficient cause", which contains the rules of correct thinking and is the basis of logic.

The existence of an object depended on the "principle of *sufficient cause*"; to think of the existence of an object not based on this principle would constitute a clear "*development*".

God was a "*necessary*" being by his own essence. In the divine essence, wisdom, universal power, goodness, will, and freedom existed "*harmoniously*" in a unity.

According to the contemporary German thinker Hartmann (1882-1950), the founder of the "*me-existentialism*" movement, "*existentialism*" was a science that analysed the principles of existence.

In the process, German ideologists such as Kant, Schelling and Hegel "opposed" ontology: Kant proposed "*empiricism*", Schelling "*transcendental thought*" and Hegel "*manizk*" as a substitute for ontology, which they opposed.

Despite these objections, some thinkers tried to develop ontology based on "fictions". Especially the "*critical ontology*" developed by Hartmann, who argued that it was "*based on an objective foundation*", maintained its influence for a long time: He argued that it was necessary to distinguish between "*the theory of knowledge*" and "*the theory of being*" because almost all mistakes arise from "confusing" these two. According to him, there were four steps from bottom to top:

- 1) The material plane of existence;
- 2) Organic existence step
- 3) The spiritual plane of existence and
- 4) The step of spiritual existence.

Hartmann said that the tendency to seek the fundamental principle or the cause of the universe in only one of these steps was the source of "le/seti yanigi- s". According to him, materialists sought the answer to the question at the "*material level*", while metaphysicians and idealists sought the answer at the "*spiritual level*". However, these steps *could not "descend"* to each other, in other words, the laws of one *could not be "applied"* to the other. Although each step of existence saw the previous step as a "necessity" and in this context there was a "connection" between them, yet each step of existence was "independent" and "autonomous" from the previous step or steps. Each stage of existence lived "*together*" dependence and independence. Each stage had *its own laws*; these laws were not valid for other stages of existence.

Hartmann also opposed the notion of evolution; the idea of evolution implies that the universe originated *from "matter"* or "*God*" as the sole source.

It was the product of the need to be able to think that the universe originated *from a single source*. If it were accepted that the universe originated from a single source, *they would naturally "connect" to each other spontaneously and form a "firJiN"*. But such an idea remained *"farewell"* and *"shaky"*, he added. According to him, there was no *"prior cause"* to prove this. To argue that the levels of existence had emerged from each other as a result of evolution would neither *"add" nor "subtract" anything from them, but would only "impose meta-mics" on the levels of existence*.

Although the existence of the upper step was based on the *"disastrous stone"* structure of the lower step, this did not mean that the higher step was *"determined"* by the lower step.

One of the most famous of the arguments that have influenced sociological studies to a certain extent is the *"karo/shifter"*. The French thinker Gabriel Marcel is the pioneer of existentialism, which originates from *"religion"*. According to him, man was a being of *"faith"*; religion was the basic element and the only being that formed the basis of religion was *"God"*. As a thinking being, man entered the universe from his own *"self"*. Opposing this religious view, J. P. Sartre, inspired by the *"godless"* view of the German philosopher Heidegger, preferred to *"break"* the bond between man and God for the benefit of man. Existentialism developed in two directions in the process:

1) On a metaphysical and idealist ground; on a *"godlike"* level by Gabriel Marcel (1889-1969), Jaspers (1883-1969), Nicolas Berdiaeff (1879-1948), Lev Chestov (1866-1938) and Martin Bu- ber (1878-1965); and

2) On the ground of objectivity, Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) and Albert Camus (1913-1960) developed it on a *"godless"* level.

23. *"Modernity is homelessness for Heidegger. Philosophy is no longer the home of his thought; on the contrary, it is a capricious and prescriptive host. >u*

Existentialism, based on the idea of the inseparability of "I" and "existence", questioned man in the face of "God", "death" and "non-existence".

According to Sartre's understanding, man creates his own essence; the only object that creates its own essence is man. In every object other than man, "doing" comes before "being"; it is only man who first exists and then "makes himself". It is only man who first "exists" and then "creates" his essence; he himself determines how he will be and where he will end up. man *cannot be "defined"* before he exists, because before he exists he is nothing, but only after he exists he will be "something".

Existentialists started from Descartes' maxim "*I dream, therefore I exist*": According to them, this was the only "*absolute-truth*" that consciousness reached by itself. For any truth to exist, there had to be an "*absolute truth*". With this truth, man could arrive at others from himself, he could "*come through*" others in order to arrive at his own truths. Others were "*necessary*" for man both to exist and to know himself. Nevertheless, it was only the human being himself who "*made*" himself; he had to pass through others in order to "*evaluate*" what he had done.

Although the existentialists started from Descartes, they were against Descartes' thought:

- 1) Descartes' "I" was not an "I" that made itself, but a thinking "I"; since thinking means consciousness, the "I" was entirely "consciousness" and did not act according to "key".

He calls himself a thinker, not a philosopher; he places himself in the line of thought of Heraclitus and Parmenides, not Plato." (Ejder Özge; *Heidegger's Modernity Criticism on the Concept of Distress before the D'uş*, - Cogito; Üç Aylık Düşünce magazine; Yapı Kredi Yayınları; İstanbul- 2010; Issue: 64; p. 236) 236)

2) Descartes' "I" did not think directly; on the contrary, there was something that thought in him; there was a "*substance*" separate and independent from his own self; the thoughts were not his own, but the thoughts of this "substance".

According to existentialists, man existed first; man first came into the world. Existence was then defined and determined. By being thrown into the world, by suffering there, man "*created*" his own essence to fight for. Man was responsible for what he was; since he had conceived his essence, *he* was also responsible for it.

Under the influence of Sartre⁽²⁴⁾, the "*immovable horizon of Existentialism*", which spread widely in France, soon turned into an "*action*"; the student youth, who considered themselves Existentialists and were motivated by the maxim "*to exist is to act*", took action against past values and the social order; they set out to reorganise their lives according to the principles of Existentialism. Writers and illustrators, caught in the "whirlwind" of the same influence, began to produce

24. "Appearance does not hide the essence, it reveals it: Appearance is essence. The essence of a being is no longer a necessity buried deep within that being, but the self-evident law governing the flow of its appearances, the cause of the sequence... But we can say with certainty that the essence, as the cause of the sequence, is nothing but the connection between appearances, that is, it is itself an appearance... Thus the phenomenal being reveals itself, reveals its essence as much as it reveals its existence, and the phenomenal being is nothing but a well-connected sequence of these self-disclosures, these manifestations... Since there is nothing behind appearing and it only shows itself (...), it cannot be carried by a being other than its own being, appearing is not a thin membrane of nothingness that separates subject-being from absolute-being..." (Sartre, Jean-Paul; *Artık ve Hiçlik* *Phenomenological Ontoloji Denemesi* (Translation: Turhan Ilgaz- Gaye Çankaya Eksen); İthaki Yayınları; Second Edition; İstanbul- 2009 pp, 20- 21-22)

"the ni-necessity of the unity of the unity of the night in the night" savundu.

Although the existentialist conceptions of *"selfhood and finitude"* led thinkers such as Sartre, Camus and Simone de Beauvoir into a *"progressive channel"*, they still could not *"free themselves"* from the dead ends of metaphysics and idealism.

Existentialism;

- a) Objective existence to human existence;
- b) human existence to personal existence and
- c) By trying to reduce personal existence to personal thought, he necessarily arrived at idealism.

Materialist Sources of Alevi Sharia

"By abandoning **taken** paths, common
areas, stapled judgements
we can reach a density of concrete analyses.²⁵

After following the *"series"* of matter and existence, we can turn to the *"sources of Alevi sheziat in the pseudo-philosophical dimension"*.

Alevi philosophy is the philosophy of *"Sudur"* or *"Isi philosophy"*, which is the philosophy of the pioneering Sufis who, in Anatolia, *"against"* the worldview of God, drew themselves to the *"ground of enlightenment"* and *"shaped the worldview of man"* under the guidance of reason and under the cover of Sufism.

In the hands of the pioneering Sufis, the Anatolian Bâtînî Philosophy, i.e. the philosophy of *Su- dur* or *Light*, was, under medieval conditions, on the one hand

25. (Edelman Bernard; Nietzsche: *Kayıp Bir Kıt*a (Translation: Ferhat **Tay-** lan); Cogito; Üs Aylık Düşünce Dergisi, Yapı Kredi Yayınları; İstan- bul- 2001; Sayı: 25; s, 56)

While becoming the "*spiritual focus*" of the people, on the other hand, it evolved into an ideology that would carry the people "*to salvation*".

Anatolian Bâtîmîlik, by asserting that the first founding principle was "*matter*", "*existence*", created the story of "*in- sanca dimnişin*" to God and death, which would realise the understanding of "*let us die before we die and let us resurrect*".

In the spiritual sense, belief is a state of trust and attachment to "supposition" that begins where knowledge ends.²⁶In this context, "ignorance" underlies every belief.

People "*hay'a1*" what they do not know; more precisely, they try to complete it by imagining it; they "*choose*" one of various possibilities and become attached to it. In other words, belief in general arises from a need to "*know*". In the extension of this understanding, the assertion that "*believing is a need*" turns into the assertion that "*we do not need to know*" in the subtle sense. In the process;

a) In the case of the functioning of imagination in dependence with practice, "*scientific assumptions* ,

b) In the event that it is detached from practice, "beliefs" emerge.

If beliefs are "*checked*" by practice, they cease to be beliefs and become "knowledge"; if they are not checked and verified by practice, they turn into "empty beliefs" by utilising the unlimited freedom of the uncontrolled imagination.

However, beliefs or religious assumptions carry a certain "value" in terms of science. However, their value does not depend on their-

26. "the believer derives his existence from his 'belief'. True belief is not simply a doctrine, a content to be believed in; on the contrary, it is the source of energy that feeds the whole life of the believer." (Habermas Jürgen; *Philosophical Essays Between Nature, Philosophy and Language* (Translation: Ali Nalbant); Yapı Kre- di Yayınları; Second edition; İstanbul- 2012; p. 125): 125)

not in their own reality, but in the needs they try to fulfil for socio-economic reasons.

Every story, fairy tale, etc. is the product of a certain "imagination"; people who want to explain scientifically unexplainable facts in this way make valuable "*intuitions*" while imagining them: These "*intuitions*" are the result of human thought.

§It is nothing but "*natural facts that impose themselves on the thought*". With the realisation of this approach, the laws of nature, i.e. the "*dialectics*", i.e. the material structure of the universe, could be grasped through "*scientific intuitions*". In the historical process, materialism's "*moment of truth*" to idealism is due to the "*freshness*" of scientific intuitions. Humanity was in "*reality*" at the beginning; the ability to "*interact*" with reality, to imagine, developed much later. Therefore, while the products of belief are "*scientific*", the reasons for belief are "*unscientific*".

At this point it should be noted that "*forbidden cultures*" in general and "*Alevism*" in particular are not "*cultures of knowing*" but "*cultures of changing*" ⁽⁷⁾: Cultures of change are internalised and transmitted through "*life experiences*". "To have experienced something means, in colloquial usage, to have had an 'experience'. To have an experience means to go through something, to be confronted with something and to do it in such a way that it is mediated by it. What is experienced is something that one did not expect or anticipate, something that defies expectations.

27. "In the eleventh of his Theses on Feuerbach, Marx, referring to the role that knowledge has to play in the historical process, writes: 'So far philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways; the question is to change it.' Marxist intellectuals see themselves as instruments of the historical process that will bring about a classless society. The communist project transforms theory into a material force, makes knowledge the means of changing the world. The intellectual only becomes the perpetrator of universal mis- mission as long as he takes part in the struggle for the abolition of classes and wage labour." (Berardi, Franco "Bifo"; *Jtufi İşbnşmda/Yabancılaşmadan Autonomiye* (Translation: Fırat Genç); Metis; İstanbul- 2012; p, 26

is something that happens when one has not experienced something before. Since the unexpected encounter with something that has not been experienced before brings 'exposure' to experience, 'experience' conjures up ideas of passivity, even loss of control. Experience is the space in which we learn through 'suffering'... And finally, going through an experience brings about both the transformation of the individual and the emergence of a new object field for consciousness. Although this conception of transformation or turning (...) can be modelled on what happens in paradigm shifts in the natural sciences, the aim of science is to eliminate such shifts. The image of life without experience is ultimately the image of life without history, as if the meaning of life lies in its external contiguity: Death. There can be no historical life without experience; only lives articulated through experience can be fully and consciously historical."²⁸

In this context, Anatolian Alevism is basically a philosophy of "*a combination of idealism and materialism*". This philosophy, in general, is based on the "*metaphysical enlightenment*" that formed the basis of the Ancient Age of Enlightenment and the XVIII;

- a) It emphasises the constant nourishment by man and human reason as a "*necessity*",
- b) I don't know whether he's trying to "*reduce*" his metaphysics to his physics
- c) Since it endeavours to perceive the entities of belief in the form of a collection of objective entities, in some cases it takes tentative steps towards "*true enlightenment*", or "*socialist enlightenment*", which was structured on "*dialectic and term materialism*" in the second half of the XIXth century.

The philosophy of emanation or Light; "*making nature and God identical*

28. Bernstein J.M., Why? **Meta-grid** Experience and Ethics (Translation: Kemal Atakay) Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; pp, 225-226)

The "God is all that is", which is based on the "m" assumption and has its source in Plato, whose idealism is predominant, and who says, "Everything was created from God; the objective universe was formed from a spiritual essence, or evolved through dialectical transformations": everything came from God; the objective universe arose from a spiritual essence, or the universal spirit was born through dialectical transformations".

"*فهمنا Naturalism*", which was blended with the Sufi understanding of Wahdat-i Body-Vahted-i Existence by the pioneering Sufis, was interpreted and realised as "*The Real One*".

The universe is the universe; the sum total of all the beings in his house is God;

Agriculture is composed of a material substance", the "Materialist

It is nothing but the understanding of "naturalism".

Until only yesterday, the Alevi-Bektashi pioneers of this land were trying to reduce *the "vengeful"* side of Naturalism to its "*materialist*" side. But today that philosophy continues.

Those who claim to be the reformists have begun to follow the "*opposite*" path: They are thinking about *how to "reduce"* the materialist side to the alcoholic side; in other words, they are looking for ways of "*jumping from the mind, of being locked in the mind*".

If the situation goes on like this, in the near future they will be happy to "*live together in peace*" in an environment of "*fundamentalist-religious belief*". What is this intellectual tendency, this attitude, if not a "betrayal" of the source of philosophy on which they feed?

Since the original interpretation of my philosophical source is not unambiguously finalised, they remain "*stuck*" between a fictional beginning and a fictional end, on a cycle that goes from God and back to God again. Although they use the idealism they brought to consciousness in the first half of the cycle in a way that "flows" into the materialism they created in the second half, and although they endeavour to "*lumise*" the last fictional metaphysical week through man, which they perceive as a synthesis, *they* are unable to "*digest*" the real enlightenment, that is, the socialist enlightenment. When they come under the siege of socialist enlightenment, they are content with "*making references*".

Anatolia, the Land of Philosophy

"God existed and died and will revive again, God became man and man became god..."²⁹

Let us briefly evaluate Anatolia, the "soil" of Alevi philosophy: At the beginning of the 20th century, Anatolian people were closer to religious and intellectual values of humanity than the Arab Bedouins and the Turks of Central Asia. Because the people of this land had recognised *the "monotheistic thought"*, which is the product of a more civilised "head", much earlier.

The formation of the monotheistic thought environment started in the second millennium BC when the Assyrians established shopping centres in Anatolia. This belief, which was gradually shaped and monopolised, was reinforced at the end of the IVth century BC, when Alexander entered Anatolia after defeating the Persians. After the death of Alexander, the Seleucids, who held the Syrian territories and who could not save themselves from the influence of Hebrew beliefs despite their adherence to the polytheistic Gerek civilisation, carried the monotheistic Palestinian beliefs to the southern parts of Anatolia.

In the Middle Ages, the essence of everything was *"religion"*, and on the grounds that religious judgements were definitive, decisive judgements, the thought of Moses and Jesus *"prepared"* Anatolian people for the thought of Muhammad.

The Hebrew religion, which began to spread in the XIV-XII centuries B.C., began to present the first products of thought as *"immutable principles"*: The only sovereign power was God; the rulers of the earth were nothing but prophets sent by Him; the objective universe was *"transient"*, the permanent one was the *"universe of spirits"*, perceived as the solid God. Man is a

29. (Deleuze Gdles; *Superhuman: Against Dialectics* (Trans. Turhan 11- gaz); Cogito; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Yapı Kredi Publications; İstan- bul- 2001; Vol: 25; s, 116

He was a being of "*faith*" and was "*guilty*" because he had committed a "crime" in the *land of bliss* because of his passions. Therefore, the true society was the society founded according to God's commandments and based on God's sovereignty.

As can be seen, Anatolian people entered the Middle Ages, which is accepted to have begun at the end of the IV century A.D., by experiencing for a long time the process prepared by a monotheistic monotheistic belief in monotheism, the process of being under the rule of a *power* that one does not know, that one does not see, but whose existence *one is responsible for "believing"* in. The thought of Jesus and the teaching of Muhammad, which followed him, further "*reinforced*" and "*made more conscious*" this situation that "*oppressed*" human thought and personality.

Orpheusianism and Pythagoreanism also entered into the monotheistic confusion of beliefs of the pre-Islamic Anatolian Middle Ages. Orpheusianism originated in Ancient Greece in BC.

In the VIth century, it emerged as a movement that claimed that salvation depended on "*how one lived*" in this world and that only an "ascetic" life could save the purity of the soul from the pollution of the body. In other words, Orphic religion was a pre-Hellenic Thracian religion; it was first born in Thrace, then spread to Greece and Rome. According to Orphic belief, man was the "*embodiment*" of good and evil; only through purification could he attain "*good fortune*". This could only be realised through "*soul migration*"; the soul would "migrate" from body to body in order to purify itself from its evil side. In the following period, Orphe- rationalism became an "alternative" to the political-religious order that ruled the Greek world.

Pythagoreanism, on the other hand, originated from the Greek mathematician and philosopher Pythagoras (580-500 B.C.)³⁰, but it continued to be a

30. "But it is also claimed that Aristotle said the following about Pythagoras: 'There is one kind of intelligent animal, which is God; another is man; Pythagoras is an example of the third kind, >>

institutionalised in the V.-IV. centuries B.C.E. by the ruminators is a doctrine. In other words, it is "mystical" Greek life.

In ancient Greece and Thrace there was the worship of Dionysus³¹, which preceded Orpheusianism: Dionysus was the pre-Greek god of agriculture. The whole characteristic of the Dionysian religion was that its adherents came from themselves *as if they had "gone mad"* and believed that they had taken God into themselves. Their aim was to bring man to divine "perfection" and to "identify" him with God.

In the course of time, Dionysian worship³² arified" form

Derman; *Pythagoras / A Mystery Prophet*; Say Yayılan; İstanbul- 2008; p, 13)

31. "Dionysus is at once the principle of unity and individuality, of identity and difference, of transgressing boundaries in the name of a complete common happiness and yet calling man to an autonomous life as the god of progress and evolution... Tragic art, then, is the constant of science, political progress, revolutionary optimism and ethical culture..." (Eagleton, Terry; *Sweet Violence/The Tragic Concept*. Translated by: Kutlu Tunca-; İstanbul- 2012; p, 89)

32. "In Dialectics of Enlightenment, Horkheimer and Adorno defend the view that Enlightenment in all circumstances turns into its own mythology. According to them, the fate that oppressed the heroes of antiquity reappears in the modern world as logic. To this statement it can be added that the gods return to the stage in the form of Reason, divine grace in the guise of scientific necessity, and the goddess of vengeance in the guise of kalum... In this case, the resurrection of mythology is an example of 'the overcoming of the blind oppression of nature within the self'... The dream of Schlegel, Schelling, Hölderlin, Nietzsche and Wagner is the rebirth of myth on an epic scale at the centre of the modern age. Only in this way will an atomised social order be endowed with the collective symbolic resources it requires. Dionysus must return, counteracting a bland individualism with an ecstatic indifferenciation of the self, dissolving the autonomous subject back towards a blissful pre-conscious union with nature. Modernity is here somewhat confronted with Hobson's choice. Only by distancing ourselves from nature can we confront it, fend off the burning that threatens our existence, and thus secure the conditions of happiness; but this detachment from nature is a painful event and never heals the wound in the depths of the soul." (Eagleton, Terry; *Sweet Violence / Tragic Concept*. Trans. Kutlu Tunca-; İstanbul- 2012; p. 294)

Orpheusianism; the *"refined"* form of Orpheusianism became Pythagoreanism. According to the Pythagoreans, the universe had a beginning: The universe was formed around a *"fiery centre"*; *"numbers"*, which necessitated the opposition of double and single, unlimited and limited, *were the "principle"* of knowledge as well as existence, and the properties of numbers explained the properties of objects. Everything consisted of *"opposites"*; the problem was to establish *"harmony"* between opposites. Body, soul, men and institutions were nothing but *"forms of existence"* of number or numbers.

As can be seen, according to Pythagoras, the basis of the universe was *"number"*; all objects were *"numbers in appearance"*. Man began with *"one"* and thought with *"one"*. The number *"one"* was both *"one"* and *"dual"*; it was the *"union"* of a *"male"* principle and a *"female"* principle. The number two was *"assimilated"* from the number one; this assimilation created the number three. The being *"born"* from the combination of the female principle and the male principle was a *"unity in one"*. The number one rejoined this three and the number four was born: All other numbers were formed by the *"multiplication"* and *"addition"* of these first four sacred numbers.

The number was a *"unit"* quantity believed to be sacred. The number three seemed very interesting to people because everything in the universe was formed by the union of a *"female principle"* (2) and a *"male principle"* (1), resulting in a product (3).

There were three separate spaces around humans, namely Sky (1), Earth (2) and Water (3). As abstract thought developed, people perceived that the distinction between various entities consisted of a *"distinction of numbers"*. Centuries later, Pythagoreanism in the West and Hurûfîlîcism in the East were born out of this understanding.

Pythagoras, who also received the *"soul migration"* from the Orpheusians.

In the process, they were also greatly influenced by the dogmas of the same faith that the *body is buried in a tomb like a grave, where the body is chained as a junior reza*.

With this position, the Pythagoreans, on the one hand, contributed to the formation of "*rationalism*" by materialising nature, and on the other hand, they gained a "*theocratic and conservative*" quality with their "*magic*" teachings based on "*number mysticism*"; they enabled "*oppressive*" governments in the areas they dominated.

These beliefs and teachings originating from the W e s t e r n From Anatolia and Thrace, he inserted himself into the affairs of Asia Minor, giving new force to the monotheistic "*confusion*" of faith of the Anatolian Middle Ages; he gave it a momentum; he reinterpreted it on Anatolian soil.

In a way, "*tasavvu*", which developed in the extension of Anatolian primeval thought by feeding on Neo-Platonism, Chinese, Indian and Iranian thought-beliefs, and which is the main source of philosophy that created Anatolian Alevism, had already begun to "*wander*" in the "*sand province*" with the "*whirlpool*" of Orpheusianism-Pythagorasm, albeit with almost the same values in a faint form, before it entered these lands or was born in these lands.

At about the same time as Pythagoras, the values related to Zoroastrian belief and thought, which emerged as a phenomenon in Iranian lands and developed and took shape in the process of evolving from polytheism to monotheism, and the Orpheusian-Pythagorean values "*travelling*" in this land did not hesitate to "*meet*".

In other parts of the world that are not prone to monotheistic belief, especially in Europe, the Middle Ages, as a reward for the "*lack*" of cerebral human achievements, was a complete "*rupture*" from the First Age. On the other hand, in Anatolia, which is prone to monotheistic beliefs, the Middle Ages, as a reward for the realisation of cerebral human achievements, did not bring a "*rupture*" as in the West. New beliefs and new living conditions could not completely "*destroy*" the beliefs and thoughts coming from the Ancient Age.

len could not create social upheavals *that would* completely "negate" the enlightenment tradition; in short, it could not change Anatolia "radically". What it did do was to "expel" the worldly belief of the Ancient Age from the place of living, to push it "into the bosom".

The Anatolian people, who had an attitude towards the Jesus Sharia under the guidance of the values mentioned above, in order to get out of this situation *in which they were "tied in knots"* by their own internal dynamics, and to find ways of belief "against" the belief they did not believe in the "belief of *the bâtin*" channel; "primitive communist" masses of people who would flow from Asia to Anatolia "in the guise of barbarians", who had an attitude towards the ruler *who was "driving"* the system called civilisation, and the citizens who would break away from the Arabian Peninsula, who would come from the Arabian Peninsula, who would be formed under the conditions of "opposition" against orthodox Islam, and who had an attitude towards Muhammad's Sharia.

(First Article Do yor)
ANATOLIAN PRIMEVAL

"We alone have created the world that concerns man',
says Nietzsche.
'Unfortunately', he continues, 'we always
forget that we are the creators of the world'. That another and
transcendent world has been created in place of this world, that
humanity has realised the other world,
and the world in which he lives as a fake.
that he has been wasting his days for ages."³³

Against materialism's assertion that "*matter is something that exists independently of consciousness*", idealism asserted "*the primacy of consciousness and the primacy of thought*". In the course of time, this "*fight*" took the form of a "*struggle between religion and science*."³⁴ The Anatolian thinkers of the Ancient Age beat longingly" and trying to "*deduce*" the making of nature from nature,

33. Daldeniz Elif; *Zeüst: FHsinti Duymayan İnsan*; Cogito; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Yapı Kredi Publication; Istanbul- 2001; Issue: 25; s, 254

34. "..., the slRlflr between forms of knowledge is as indeterminate as the boundaries between lTladde and spirit. Death is in one sense the highest point of objectivity because it literally falls beyond our sphere of experience, and in another sense it is the true essence of the human subject." (Eagleton, Terry; *Sweet Violence and the Tragic Kawant*. Translation. Kutlu Tunca-; Istanbul- 2012; p, 350)

They were natural scientists: They thought that there was a "first substance" at the origin of existence; the idea of a divine and spiritual "first" did not even cross their minds.

Water appeared: Water gave birth to everything

"If the goats do not pray, not a single grass will grow in these mountains. If the grasses do not pray, not a single drop of rain will fall from the sky. Therefore, all living things are one for us. As my goat is, so is my son, so is the mountain, so is the water."³⁵

Thales (625-545 B.C.) set out to search for the first substance at the origin of existence and suggested that it was "water". According to him, the basis of existence was not "spiritual" but "objective". As a result of the "condensation and relaxation" of water, all types of existence were formed. Solid objects were the result of "condensation", thin and volatile objects were the result of "relaxation". Water was "living", that is, "alive", so it was "artificial" to divide beings into animate and inanimate. Existence was in constant transformation; all substances derived from water were transformed back into "water".

The earth was flat and floated on the "Okeanos", a vast water. "Okeanos" was the "ancestor" of all gods and beings, it was alive; it had no limit and no end; it was not bound by time.

Until Thales, thinkers had no consciousness of analysing the universe as a "problem". Man was not a thinker but a "believer" in the face of natural phenomena. For the first time, Thales brought nature and natural phenomena to a state of "philosophy in the light of reason" that would carry them "beyond" beliefs.

The movement of reason that began in the early ages continued in the Middle Ages.

35. (Uzun Salih; *Muha azakârlık Cemre D'üşm "uş Hali*,- Radikal İki; 11.03.2012 Sunday; p, 6)

n Alevism-Bektashism, which is the organisation of Alevism-Bektashism, water symbolises *the "door of marilet"* in the Four Doors and Forty Makams, which is its educational doctrine. It is one of *the "four kinds of elements"* perceived as eternal and participating in the formation of the types of beings.

According to Imam Jafar's Order, human beings are originally composed of the combination of "air, water, earth and fire", each of which is the origin of a gate human being and called "aiaşır-ı erbaa". These four objects sit on four bases (the world of non-living things - the world of plants and plants - the world of animals and the world of human beings). It also contains some meanings beyond participating in the formation of types of beings, including human beings. In this context, giving heart, acceptance is an extension of water and has ten characteristics:

- 1) Flowing;
- 2) Wisdom;
- 3) Knowledge;
- 4) Advice;
- 5) Thought;
- 6) No;
- 7) Kemal;
- 8) Virtue
- 9) Forgiveness and
- 10) Generosity

Again, according to the Bâtınî Philosophy, the word "iâ" in the Word of Tawhid is perceived as proof of fire, the word "*ilah*" as proof of air, the word "*iîîa*" as proof of water, and the word "Allah" as proof of earth.

Following Thales, Anaximander (610-545 B.C.) thought that the first being could not be a directly perceptible substance and called this substance "apeimn", meaning "*infinite*", "*unlimited*" and "*unknowable*".

Moving the first matter from "*concrete to abstract*" was an extremely important development for that period. Moreover, by asserting that the "apeiron" contained "*all opposites*", Anax-Simandros was "*observing the fundamental laws of dialectics*".

Air Appeared: Air Created Everything

"If there is a choice between not understanding at all and half understanding, Adorno prefers not understanding at all. Because for him 'half-understanding and half-realisation are not the preliminary stage of education, but its mortal enemy'." ³⁶

Following Anaximander, Anaximenes of Anatolia (588-525 BC) wanted to transform "*apeiron*" back into "concrete". And he named the first substance "air". Air led to the formation of "travelling fire" and "*condensation*" led to the formation of wind, cloud, water, earth and stone.

According to him, air, which was the founding principle, was an object of the type of "*spirit*" and was "*concrete*".

With the emergence of monotheism, the Middle Ages made the spirit the "*focal problem*". Apart from the earth, water, air and fire, which constitute concrete beings, "*spirit*" was regarded as the "source" of everything in the universe.

Primitive people, who had not yet reached the understanding of the soul, went through a "*babyish*" phase, like a baby thinking that its toys are "*alive*" and talking to them; they thought that objects "*hear and think*" like themselves; this understanding of animism was called "*animism*".

Religious animism (animism), which is based on the belief that objects have "*souls*" like human beings, was built on this "*infantile*" understanding; later on, this understanding of "*soul*" was transformed into the understanding of "*God*".

Anatolian Bâtınîlism gave a "special" importance to the concept of the soul within the scope of the "*tasa vvvuN*" created with the "*nourishment*" of Neo-Platonism. Water, air, earth and fire, the "*ku-*

36. Toprak Metin/ Karabağ imran; *Adorno's Halbbildung* Kura- man G'üncelliği; Felsefe logos; 2004/3; Bulut Yayınevi; p, 143

rational element", while emphasising *the "vitality"* event as the "soul-*hun* in the form of *an* action".

According to the doctrine of the Four Gates and Broken Maqam, "*air*" was the symbol of the gate of Sharia; it was perceived as eternal, and was one of the four elements that participated in the formation of the types of beings.

According to the Order of Imam Ja'far, the human being was originally composed of a combination of air, water, earth and fire, each of which was the origin of a gate human being and called "*anısır-ı erbaa*".

These four elements sat on the "*four bases*" and had meanings beyond their participation in the formation of the species of beings, including man: In the faith, "azarJama" was perceived as an extension of the air and had ten characteristics:

- 1) Asceticism;
- 2) Fear of God;
- 3) Prayer;
- 4) Kulluk;
- 5) Ablution;
- 6) Fasting;
- 7) Cross;
- 8) Submission to God;
- 9) the Word of the Shahada and
- 10) Remembrance of God's name.

In Bâtmî Philosophy, the word "Jâ" in the Word of Tawhid was ascribed to fire; the word "ilahi" to air; the word "*illa*" to water; and the word "*Al- lah*" to earth as evidence of belief.

Pythagoras' ideas, which we have already analysed, gained a "*new quality*" by blending with religious beliefs in the following period. They attracted a great deal of interest both in the East and the West. Hurûfism, which is based on the assertion that letters and numbers carry some "*mysterious g'üçlez*" and which significantly influenced Anatolian Alevism-Bektashism, was indirectly "*fed*" by Pythagoras' thought.

The philosophical theory developed by Pythagoras was transformed into a "*religion*" a hundred years after his death, especially with Plato's understanding of the universe inspired by him. According to this new belief system, which was mixed with the Orpheus beliefs widespread in Thrace, there were some mysterious properties in the numbers that constituted the essence of the universe. The essences of divine beings, the secret powers that governed the universe, and the natural events that affected human beings were caused by "*the combination and formation of numbers in different proportions*".

This doctrine, known as Neo-Pythagoreanism and based on the connection between "*faith and number*", entered the last two monotheistic religions that were to change form: In the East, the perception fostered by the number "*one*" became a symbol of God's "firJig?", while in the West, in Christianity, the perception fostered by the number "*three*" created the famous "iiçeme".

Fire appeared: Everything was created from fire

"The Hermit is first and foremost a being devoid of scientific context; the idea of form is akin to the idea of the Hermit. one hundred per cent contrary.""

The Anatolian philosopher Heraclitus (540-480 BC) argued that the first matter was "*fire*". Because fire "*moved*" more than air and water. According to Heraclitus, matter had neither beginning nor end; it was an "*inextricable*" part of the rhythmically occurring movement. This order, which is the same for all beings, was neither created by "*gods*" nor by "*men*". *As long as* this fire, which has no beginning and no end, "*burned*", this order had always existed and would exist forever. The universe was "*uncreated*" and "*would not disappear*".

37. Barthes, Roland; '*agdas* fiöyînfir (Trans. Tahsin Yücel); Metis Publications; Third edition; Istanbul **2003**; p,49

The universe was in a constant state of change-transformation; this change-transformation, which originated from the constituent element called fire, was of two types, *"from the top down and from the bottom up"*. However, this ascent and descent was not *"random and irregular"*. It depended on a certain *"law"*, a universal *"rule"*. The organising principle of this was *"logos"*. *"All change-transformations based on the logos led to the formation of types of being; the only element of this formation was nothing but the transformation of fire"*.

Heraclitus' perception of fire as *"living"*, his explanation of existence as a continuous *"change-transformation"*, his derivation of existence from *"bif"*, and his conceptualisation of multiplicity as *"appearance"* had a *"profound"* effect on monotheist thought movements in general and Anatolian Bâtinism in particular.

While Islamic thought used the term *"kalam"* for *"Jogos"*, Sufism, which originated from Neo-Platonism, interpreted *"Jogos"* as *"speaking word"* (kelam-ı natık) or *"ce vher"*, which appears as the objectification of light at the farthest point from God.

The concept of *"logos"*, which was put forward by the great thinker of Antiquity, Heraclitus, in the sense of *"universal necessity"* as the law of existence and which expressed the fields of reason and knowledge, did not have the meaning of deity. In Plato, *"logos"* was transformed into God, the source of ideas; in Neo-Platonism, it was transformed directly into God; and in Christianity, it was transformed into an aspect of *the holy "ûçleme"* in the sense of *"holy spirit"*.

According to the doctrine of the Four Gates and Forty Makams, *"fire"* symbolised the gate of the sect. It was perceived as eternal and eternal and constituted one of the *"four t'ûr elements"* that participated in the formation of the species of beings.

According to the Order of Imam Ja'far, human beings are originally composed of air, water, earth and fire, each of which is the origin of a door of human beings and called *"anasır-ı erbaa"*.

were made up of. These four objects sat on "*four bases*" and had meanings beyond their participation in the formation of species of beings, including human beings. In this context, "*leading man to evil*" was an extension of fire and had ten characteristics:

- 1) Ignorance;
- 2) Self-righteousness;
- 3) Anger
- 4) Sadness
- 5) Jealousy
- 6) rebellion against God;
- 7) Greed;
- 8) Hatred;
- 9) Blasphemy;
- 10) Provocation and mediation.

In Anatolian Bâtınîlism, the word "*IN*" in the "*Kelime-i Tevhid*" refers to fire; the word "*ilah*" refers to air; the word "*i/la*" refers to water; and the word "*Allah*" refers to earth as "*proof*".

The Anatolian-Greek sage Anaxagoras (500-428 B.C.) argued that the constitutive principle that initiates being is a substance called "*nous*", which would later be called "*soul*". According to him, "*nous*" was the constitutive essence of being; it was the main source of all movements, all events gathered under the heading of movement, separation, union, speciation and thinking. It was a kind of "*ev- rense/ ruth*" because of the creative power it carried; at the same time, it was an "*erN*" with "*vitality*", effective, superior quality, creative-developing.

With these characteristics, "*nous*" was not abstract, but "*concrete*", material. However, its matter "*resembled*" the matter that constitutes other objects: Its existence was characterised by the "*stages*" of its effects that emerged into the field of appearance. In the beginning, there was an independent, free, self-sufficient "*nous*" whose existence did not require another existence. It was this nous that brought the irregular mass called "*khaos*" into "*order*" and set it in motion, and thus brought it into "*becoming*".

was the "nous" that made possible the "OJush". "OJush" is the "iti-
"from" the "minden" began a "iareüetfe".

Anatolian Bâtîlism gave the *"divine intellect"* or *"first intellect"* (ak
akl- 1 evvel) a meaning close to "nous": In particular, the *"first intellect"*
was not an abstract entity in the "unity of the Creator" or the "unity of
Mecut"; the *"first intellect"* found its holy justification in the
"manifestation" or "objectification" of the knowledge given to it or of the
"hidden" powers inherent in it. In this sense, transforming *"the mind of
God into the mind of man"* was a "creativity" of the Alevi Philosophy of
the Motherland.

Soil Revealed: Everything Emerged from the Soil

"The world has only one secret,
and this secret lies in a single word,
The universe is a vault for humanity to search for its cipher..."

Empedocles (492-432 BC), following Anaxagoras, founded the
"Four Elements Doctrine" by adding *"earth"* to the "water" of Tha-
les, "fiava" of Anaximenes and "fire" of Heraclitus: According to
him, the universe was not dominated by "One" but by "many";
however, the number of constituent elements did not change. There
were two basic principles in the formation of beings:

- a) The unifying principle (love) and
- b) Discriminative-essentialising principle (disgust)

The soul was "migrating" from body to body. Formation was
nothing but the *"visualisation"* (s'*=') S(''-) of two opposing forces,
"love and fixation".

The earth is believed to have an essentially divine nature.

38. Barthes, Roland; *Çağdaş Söylemem* (Trans. Tahsin Yücel); Metis
Publications; Third Edition; İstanbul - 2003; p, 85

is the rod". The belief in the sacredness of the earth is a concept of "divinity" that has continued from the most primitive° 91ar- to the most advanced religions. For example;

a) In Greek mythology, Ga- ia (*earth-*1*) first emerges from an irregular void and organises the universe, creating the sky and the sea.

b) In the Altai Turkic belief, the god Kayra Kan sprinkles the soil from the depths of the water on the surface of the water and creates the heads.

c) In the belief of the North American primitives, a "*primitive tortoise*" does the same thing; it creates the world by sluicing mud from the bottom of the water.

d) In the beliefs of the peoples of North Asia, God, the sky- and dries up the waters of the sea by breathing fire on it; and he dries up the earth that will bring forth the land.

Because of these designs, the first gods were always "*earth-mother*". Adam was created from the earth.

The "*Four Elements Doctrine*" developed by Empedocles fed Neo-Platonism, which originated from Ploti- nos. The Sufi view of the universe, which is an extension of Neo-Platonism, was founded on the "*Four Elements Doctrine*" of Em- pedocles.

According to the doctrine of the Four Doors and Forty Makams, the earth symbolised the "*door of truth*". It was one of the "*four elements*" that were perceived as eternal and participated in the formation of all kinds of beings.

According to the Order of Imam Ja'far, man was originally composed of a combination of air, water, earth and fire, the so-called "*anasir-e erbaa*", each of which is the origin of a gate man. These four objects sit on the "*four bases*" and beyond participating in the formation of the species of beings, including man

It demanded certain meanings. In° sta, one's "*inner peace*" was an extension of the earth; the earth was the "*highest*" asset offered to mankind; Paradise was "*founded*" on it.

It was "the messenger", the elaborate "book" of the highest science, therefore it symbolised Shah-i-Merdan A1i. He had ten qualities:

- 1) Do not be a carer of the poor,
- 2) Don't be a good counsellor,
- 3) Fairness
- 4) Being merciful;
- 5) Knowing the light that comes from consent;
- 6) Having science;
- 7) Being counting the truth;
- 8) Being close to the truth;
- 9) Keeping your oath and
- 10) Being loyal.

In Bâtinî Philosophy, *the word "lâ" in the Word of Tawhid is "proof" for fire, "ilah" for air, "illa" for water and "Al- lah" for earth.*

Leucipnos (5th century B.C.)-Democritus (460-370 B.C.) achieved a new and superior stage in the understanding of matter in antiquity. According to them, the basis of all natural phenomena was *the "indivisible **material** particle1 1", and these particles were distinguished from each other by their quantities, their positioning in space, and their order of knowledge. Motion was a characteristic of matter; all phenomena and events were brought about by this "spontaneous motion" of matter. Matter was "beginningless and infinite". Nothing "came into being" out of nothing, and nothing that came into being became "many".*

The Anatolian philosopher Democritus became the pioneer of *"materialism"* by defending the view that existence was composed of indivisible elements called *"atoms"*.

For Democritus, philosophy is about understanding the universe and finding the first *"constituent"* elements of the beings that fill the universe. According to him, the subject of philosophy was nature; *"concrete"* beings. Being was an object occupying a certain space; not in thought, but in reality.

was what was. Because it was an object, existence was a whole "*made up*" of certain elements. The constituent elements of this whole were "atoms", which could not be divided into smaller parts and were themselves a "*whole*".

The "*atom*" was the "*constituent*" element of all kinds of existence; it was not created, it would not be destroyed. Atoms were innumerable; they had no temperature, colour or smell; yet they were solid; there was no question of an external object "*penetrating*" them; although they were invisible to the eye, *they had "form and size"*. The movement took place in "*empty space*"; empty space was not an entity, but "*nothingness*". Therefore, in the universe, one full There were "*two opposites*" such as "*atom*", which is "*atom*", and "*space*", which is empty; empty space was "*think'û1'ûsor*" because atoms moved in it.

It is inconceivable that an object that exists in the universe would disappear; what exists exists exists, and what does not exist does not exist. "*Existence*" cannot come out of non-existence and "non-existence" cannot come out of existence.

Every change takes place as a result of the "*combination and separation*" of the elements that make up the whole. Change is not random or accidental; no object arises "*by chance*"; everything has a "*cause and necessity*".

Movement is the result of the "*displacement*" of atoms in empty space; however, there is no factor external to atoms in this displacement; atoms move "*spontaneously*" and change their places while moving. For this reason, movement and displacement "*entail*" each other; one cannot exist without the other.

The formation of the types of beings in the universe is the "*condensation and relaxation*" resulting from the fast and slow movement of atoms.

In the beginning, spontaneously existing atoms were moving in empty space. During this spontaneous movement, the atoms facing each other in empty space began to "*burn*"; an "*environment*" was formed by the collision of atoms. Heavy atoms-

The gathering and condensation of atoms in the centre resulted in the formation of solid earth; the rapid movement of light atoms upwards resulted in the formation of water, air and fire.

Democritus also based his "*knowledge theory*" on the doctrine of atoms; according to him, man cannot know or comprehend an object as it really is. However, *the atoms that "hit" the body and the senses leave "marble impressions" in the person.* There are two different types of knowledge created in this way:

- 1) Real knowledge and
- 2) Untrue information.

Sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch give the "*real and unreal*" kind of knowledge. Colour, smell, taste and pain are "*unreal*"; *they* do not exist. In reality there are only "*atoms*" and *the "void"* in which atoms move. The knowledge arising from the impressions created by atoms according to the state of the body and the senses is a "*relative*" knowledge. The most reliable of the senses as a source of information is "*touch*"; the external universe is known by touch; it enables us to recognise the qualities of atoms such as "*catholicity, form*", which are perceived as real qualities. Impressions provided by the senses of sight and hearing

It is related to the "*pattern*".

Democritus argued that not only matter, but also the soul and spiritual beings are composed of atoms. According to him, the being called "*soul*", which provides "*vitality*", is in reality a "*concrete object*". It is invisible to the eye because it is made up of very fine, fast-moving, light atoms; it is a "*b'ûtun*" formed by the spontaneous "*union*" of these atoms. It is not true *that* the soul "*enters*" the body later and "*becomes an independent entity*" from the body.

As vitality is achieved *through the "union" of the atoms that make up the soul*, death is the result of the "*disintegration*" of these atoms.

it does. Therefore, vitality is a "*unification*"; death is a "*dissolution*".
me" event.

Man is a concrete being who lives in society and establishes relationships with his environment; all these achievements are the result of development: As relationships develop, human beings develop, and as human beings develop, relationships develop. For this reason, man is a "*social being*".

As an "*eastern being*", in the beginning he lived like an "animal"; he did not earn his living by production, but by gathering and hunting.

"*Culture*" is the result of continuous development and is based on *the* "*connection*" between man and his environment.

Man took his first step into the field of civilisation when he spontaneously began to make "tools". This was the beginning not only of civilisation but also of human history, the beginning of man's "*self-consciousness*" as a "*being of history*". Due to the consciousness gained, man began to perceive himself as a "*Iüiçiik ev- ren*".

(İnanç Alanının Bilimsel Görünüşlü “Sertüveni”)

NEO-PLATONISM

"..., the wounds of the
soul bleed more often in solitude. ³⁹

The scientific-looking "*adventure*" of the field of belief begins with Plato. It was P1aton who systematised the tendency not to regard what is known through the senses as real, but to regard "*necessarily imagined*" as real, thus giving "*mythology a scientific appearance*". The thought-nature dialogue initiated by the physicist philosophers of the nation was completely detached from nature with Plato's teaching; the unhindered possibilities of "*imaginative thought*" were opened to the fullest extent.

hanged.

The immaterial, "*living and immortal*" being in the form of a "*spirit*" evolved. In fact, the belief that every living being has a soul separate from its body is very old. In primitives, the soul was designed as "*so-mut*". These designs were called "*animism*". It was far from the medieval "*so-absolute soul design*". Because, in primitives, the soul design was "*concrete and material*", and the concrete soul expressed a kind of "*two-bodiedness*".

Until Plato, the soul had a material structure and

39. Borgna, Eugenio; The Valuation of Jtu/ıun. -Trans: Meryem Mine Çilinoğlu-; Yapı Kredi Publications; Istanbul-2013; p,58

Plato was the first thinker to "*abstract*" the soul.

When the soul gained independence in ^{duration}, it became "*one with the divine essence*" and acquired "*immortality*". The belief that the one with a soul "*will live forever*" was built on this foundation:

- 1) The eternal life of the unborn and the undead (like the gods of the monotheistic religion)
- 2) The eternal life of that which was born but will not die (like the gods of some polytheistic religions);
- 3) The eternal life of the souls that enter the body that is born and leave the body that dies (such as the belief in the transmigration of souls of the Hindus, Alevis and Orpheus);
- 4) I've been thinking that the souls that were born but will not die living (like the soul design of some monotheistic religions);
- 5) Eternal life as a corporeal-dead (like the soul design of the ancient Egyptians, which forms the basis of the mummification tradition);
- 6) Eternal life as bodiless-dead (like the Ancient Greek belief in Hades, the god of the afterlife);
- 7) eternal life after death with resurrection (such as the Muslim concept of judgement) and
- 8) Eternal life by dying at certain times and being resurrected at certain times (such as the lives of Attis, a Prygian god, and Adonis, a Phoenician god),

In parallel with the independence of the soul from the body, *the* "belief in *two souls*" became engraved in the consciousness;

- a) Body spirit; the spirit that keeps the human being alive during his/her life and leaves him/her only at death, the spirit of breath, the spirit of life.
- b) The free spirit; the spirit that can leave the human being and enter into other people and return again after travelling; the shadow spirit.

idea-Shape Slippery

"Modern man,
is a slave to its own production."⁰

Plato (427-347 B.C.) and Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) thought that matter would be "indeterminate" if it were perceived apart from "*idea*" and "*form*".

According to Plato, matter was basically "*non-existence*" and could exist only with the "*form*" given to it by the "*idea*".

Aristotle, on the other hand, showed the same understanding by replacing "*idea*" with "*form*". According to him, where there was no "*body*", there was no "time and space".

"*Form*" became an intensely debated philosophical term; in Plato, form was all the "*tüme1*" properties that were "*essential*" in particulars. The universals were innately present in our minds as concepts and had an "*objective reality*" as the correspondences of these concepts. While the knowledge of particulars did not exceed the quality of an opinion, universal realities, i.e. forms or ideas, were real "*objects*" of knowledge. The essence of particulars was "*nlme/forms*". Forms are "*abstract, absolute, permanent and real*", whereas particulars are in constant change.⁴The universal forms constituted the real essences and were the "*universal exemplars*" of objects. The objective "*takes its share from the form, and is*

40. Dellaloğlu Besim F.; *An Introduction: Adorno in the Age of Crisis*; Adorno: Mass, Melancholia, Philosophy; Cogito; Yapı Kredi Yayınları; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p, 26.

41. "The particular has to exist within the general, an existence outside it is not possible for the particular. Only thanks to this autonomy can the particular preserve its existence within the general without surrendering to it and force the general to change in the direction of its own preferences." (Dellaloğlu Besim F.; *An Introduction: Adorno Yüz Yasında*, - Adorno: Kitle, Melankoli, Felsefe; Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p, 18)

by resembling"; in a way, the forms were "authorised
"were not copies".

Aristotle, on the other hand, rejected his teacher's idea that form was "*independent*" of the particular and had an existence "prior" to it. According to him, form was the essence of objects, as Plato argued, but it was not "*identical*" with the substance. Form was inseparable from the particular substance and constituted the substance together with matter. The "*formed*" substance was a particular object. In this way, Aristotle in a way reduced the "abstract" fiction of his teacher Plato to "*concrete*".

In philosophy, the essence expresses the principle of "*quality-bearing*". Therefore, everything that "*bears qualities*" is an essence. When Aristotle put forward the concept of "*substance*", he did not think of any concrete object. Every piece of matter that had "*acquired form*" was a substance; in connection with this, the substance was particular and could not exist "*independently*" or "abstractly" from matter and form. Since form contained the qualities of the object, it was "*by nature*" that the substance had qualities.

Later, modern philosophy created a "*general conception of substance*" by interpreting substance in a general sense. According to

Descartes, substance was an object that could exist on its own and without relying on any other principle; it was an "*independent*" form of existence beyond the expression of concrete and particular objects.

As the absolute substance, it was "God"; as relative substances, it determined the two independent forms of existence created by God, namely "*matter and spirit*". Spinoza opposed this "*substance-dualism*" of Descartes: He argued that if there is more than one kind of being, i.e. substance, they cannot be "*independent*" of each other, that is, one substance would "*limit*" the other. According to him, a single
infinite essence

and it was both "*God*" and "*Nature*".

Leibniz is characterised by a pluralism of essences; according to him, essences were the foci of "*spiritual power*" that brought forth objects. The basic qualities of these principles, which he called "*Monad*", were "*motion*-"

tendency" and *"conceived"* the whole universe together. The whole universe was *"alive"* and in a *"basket"*.

Locke adopted Descartes' *"dualism of essence"* in its main lines; however, he treated the phenomenon of essence in a sense closer to Aristotle's conception of particulars. According to him, particulars consisted of *"qualities"* and a *"basis"* that carried them together.

Berkeley, on the other hand, denied this concept, arguing that the term *"material substance"* was meaningless: According to him, the material substance was a product of *"fiction"* that had no counterpart in reality. Spiritual substance, on the other hand, was *"reality and a principle of agency"*.

Hume denied substance in both senses: According to him, there is no impression of a substance other than and beyond the *"observed qualities"*. Objects are nothing but *"tufts of qualities"*.

Plato and Aristotle influenced all medieval thought. In this context, the mover, which does not move itself, was called *"God"*.

(Düşünce Üreten Düşünce) Tanrı

"To be divine is not to place life in the range of the impossible..., it is to renounce the security of the possible...; the limit of man is the impossible, the absence of God..."⁽⁴⁾⁽²⁾

The ancient Greek philosopher and naturalist Aristotle was the founder of "the philosophy of *science*, the *sciences of logic, observation and experiment*". Although the method of thought he adopted was based on observation, experiment and research, Aristotle's philosophy

42. Bataille Georges; *Nietzsche'nin Gitmişti* (Translation: Erdem Gökya- tan); Cogito; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Yapı Kredi Yayınları; İstan- bul- 2001; Vol: 25; s, 106-107

The path he follows and the problems he deals with take their source from Socrates and Plato.

Aristotle tries to reconcile *"experiment and rationality"*, to rebalance and "reconcile" the belief in the *"superiority of reason"* put forward by Plato with *"experiment"*. According to him, true knowledge, scientific truth, is necessary; science arises from these *"necessary truths"*, from the *"totality of propositions that cannot have any other substance"*.

In terms of metaphysics, in Aristotle, the substance is the concrete particular object; the counterpart of the subject in reality is the "concrete" object.

This definition shows a complete *"contrast"* with the understanding of his teacher Plato. For Plato, substance is the foundation itself and this view is based on the theory of *"idea"*. In order for Aristotle to justify his own theory of substance, he had to *"refute"* his teacher Plato's *theory of "idea"*. He made some reasoning to achieve this: He tried to show that although the theory of ideas was put forward to explain the nature of objects, it was not *"successful"* in this. According to him, instead of objects being *"copies"* of ideas, the opposite is true. For this reason, ideas do not come before objects but *"after"* them and cannot explain them. When ideas are abstracted from objects, they *"move away"* from explaining the concrete. Ideas, which were considered to be static and universal, were *"incapable"* of explaining concrete objects in change and movement.

The second set of reasoning carried out by Aristotle was to indicate that the relationship between objects and form or ideas was *"incomprehensible"*.

Aristotle states that Plato's understandings such as *"imitation"* or being *"traced"* or *"trace'üs'km"*, *"kaölmali"* or *"pas"* do not explain anything and do not help us to comprehend individuals.

This theory of ideas, which distinguishes forms from concrete objects

This conclusion is one of the most important the- ments of Aristotle's metaphysics. In other words, he "*reduced*" reality from the stage of abstract beings to concrete beings, *and* defined it as the world of tangible objects. Aristotle thinks that his teacher was mistaken; for him, the universal is that which is expressed by the predicate, and since the real is never a predicate, and since the real expresses the real, it is a mistake to "*compare*" them. Thysis is this or that object; it is intelligible. The universal, on the other hand, is *one of the "properties"* of the object, like a quality or a relation. To conceive the universal is necessarily to conceive the object, that is, *the "dust"*. That is to say, universals are not "objects" in themselves, they do not have a "*mere*" existence. Universals are "*real*" only if they necessarily acquire "variation" in objects.

The coexistence of universality and particularity in the concrete object Aristotle explains them in terms of "*matter and form*". Matter and form can never be separated from existence. They can only be separated in thought as "*abstraction*". Thysis is matter that has acquired "*form*". Wherever there is a particle of matter, it also has form; in this state it is "*tâE*". Form g i v e s the "fíimef" aspect of the form, while matter gives the "fíikef" aspect. The unity of "*correspondence*" between matter and form corresponds to Aristotle's "*potentiality-activity*" (dynamis energeia), which explains creation and change. Potentiality and ac- tuality are the "stages" in the development of a tizun: Potential da- ha symbolises a "later" stage, actual a more "later" stage.

When an object completes its development, it has fulfilled its "purpose", realised its "*goal*", become "*actual*". In this context, form is realisation, purpose and completion; it is the achievement of "authorisation" as an object. Article is the principle of potentiality; formed matter was, in the full sense of the word, "*potentiality*". Such a substance *does not "exist"* in reality. Every substance in reality is to some extent "*bi- f**", i.e. it has acquired "activity". This potentiality-

In its actual-actual transformation, matter acquires more and more actual forms. The absolute form, the immaterial form, is a stage which is unattainable in the universe of beings as we know it, but which is the *"goal"* of every object. Absolute form, that is, absolute actuality, is in "God". In this sense, God is the *"goal"* of every object, *the* "result" it wants to resemble.

In Aristotle, change occurs in form and is realised *"on"* matter. Change is *the "loss" and "gain" of* some of the properties that constitute the form. If the changed qualities or properties do not disrupt the identity of the object, they are *"ilindexef"*; if the changed qualities disrupt the identity of the object, they are *"anthesis"*.

On the other hand, the loss of a person's life, for example, is *"essence-defence"* because the *"essential"* quality is lost. The change of essential qualities changes the essence, i.e. the *"tiir"* of the object: Thus, the identity of the old object is *"broken"*, i.e. the identity of the object is *"realised"*. The sum of the essential qualities of an object constitutes the *"essence"* of that object.

Essence and form should not be confused with each other. Essence covers a *"selected"* part of the properties found in form. We cannot *"recognise"* a particular object only by its essential qualities. Essence is the *"common"* qualities of the species to which an object belongs; essence is universal; essence is the form of a *"species"*. To disappear is to disappear only in a species; to disappear in one species is to gain *"existence"* in another species.

In Aristotle, there are four causes governing change:

- 1) Material cause; matter that becomes an object;
- 2) Influential cause; the cause that moves and causes change;
- 3) Formative cause; the substance and essence of the object; abstract substance;
- 4) The efficient cause; the goal towards which the formation is directed; the completed result; the actualised object.

The universe is composed of "matter", which is constantly changing form, acquiring new forms, and in this way moving purposefully from potentiality to actuality. How did this ceaseless movement of matter governed by "causes" begin?

At this point, Aristotle's metaphysics turns into a "science of God".

According to him, a chain of movements that has no beginning and goes to infinity towards the past is "impossible". Such an idea cannot "unfold" movement. There must be a "first cause" that initiates the first of the movements. If this "first cause" were itself "moving", it would "necessarily" require another "principle" to "precede" it and "cause" its movement. Then it would be wrong to call it the "first cause". That

is to say, the first cause of motion "could not move"; this first cause that did not move was "God". Again, according to him, God, besides being the "first cause", is also the "last cause" of the universe.

Everything in a continuous formation gains more form and actuality; everything develops towards more "perfection". God is "absolute" actuality, i.e. "absolute" form and "complete" perfection. Therefore, in the universe-

that all development is towards God.

God is both "honourable, scientific" and "influencing" cause. In this context, God is "the thinker who thinks." Thought, on the other hand, is man's supreme ability, unique only to "man" in nature and divine.

In general, there are four kinds of movement;

1) Movement connected with and affecting the essence; the acts of "becoming and dissolution" were realised as a result of this kind of movement;

2) The movement affecting the quality; the "change-turn'ûş'ûm" appearing in the objects was realised as a result of this kind of movement;

3) Movement related to space; "displacement was realised as a result of a movement;

4) Movement affecting quantity; "*decrease-multiplication*" was realised as a result of this kind of movement.

Movements, on the other hand, are divided into two:

a) Circular motion is the motion of the most perfect sphere of existence, the sky, the sphere of existence where the stars are located. The movement from the periphery of the universe towards the centre of the universe is called 'slow' movement, and the movement from the Earth to the Sky from the bottom to the top is called 'slow' movement. Since cold objects move from up to down and hot objects move from down to up, "*mouthrlûc is related to coldness and yeğnikllk is related to heat*". "*Mathematical order*" is dominant in the movement of the space where celestial beings, perceived as "*good spirits*", are located.

b) Straight movement affects the Earth, which is perceived as a lower level of existence. The beings on the Earth are water, air, fire and earth. The movement in the form of a straight line is also in two directions, "*from the focus to the periphery* and from the *periphery* to the focus". Soil and water have a tendency to move from the periphery to the focus; fire and air have a tendency to move from the focus to the periphery. The reason that determines the type of movement of these four elements is their "*natural*" location. In the centre is the earth, around it water, then air, and finally fire is "*solid*". The movement of an element away from its "*natural*" place is realised by a "*collision*". This collision is "*the antecedent cause of a movement*".

The human being is a being made up of two separate elements, the soul and the body. The body is "*matter*", while the soul is the "*form*" that moulds it and gives it its human character. The soul, which is the "*formative substance*" of the body, is its "*goal*". The soul,

It is "not matter", but it is subordinate to the whole body, which is matter.

According to the sovereignty over matter, the soul is divided into three:

1) The plant soul is the lowest level of existence, the "*vegetative level*", characterised by "sorrow" and "absorption";

2) The animal soul, the level of existence above the plant level, the "*haevan level*", characterised by "*prayer*", "*desire*" and "*self-movement*",

3) The human soul; the highest level of existence; "*human katl*", the characteristic of this level is being "*endowed with intellect*".

The intellect is a "*being*" unique to human beings, and like the other souls, it is also "*difi*". The souls on the first two levels are "young" for the perfection of the human soul, which is a being of reason. For example, "*desire*" in the animal soul turns into "*ta-sar?ama*" and "*will*" into "*knowledge*" in human beings.

The human intellect is in two states, active and passive:

a) The intellect in the active state is self-directed, self-working, creative in terms of thinking, engages in constructive action; it is not created, and its destruction is out of the question; therefore, it is "*unlimited*".

b) The intellect, which is in the passive state, organises and processes the data provided by the senses in the body and puts them into a certain form. These data are the tools that enable the intellect to work. Its existence is based on the conditions of being of the individuals to which it is attached; it emerges and disappears with them; for this reason, it is "*eJiim/iidi*".

"Garden" of metaphysics
NEO-PLATONISM

"One who dedicates his humanity to his
faith in order to make a holy move,
has made an attempt with dire consequences... ⁴

The Egyptian philosopher Plotinus (205-270), the founder of Neo-Platonism, argued that reality is not objective, but of "*absolute spiritual nature*". Neo-Platonism is the doctrine of Plotinus, which was formed by "*developing*" the metaphysical side of Platonism.

For Plotinus, who systematised his philosophy based on the "*idea*" theory developed by Plato, the fundamental being was God, who was "*One*". God was the "infinite and active" power that created, organised and moved all objects. *The "unity of God"* included all objects and was "*identical*" with infinity. God was the "*source*" of beauty, even though He was not essentially beautiful; of form, even though He had no particular form; of acts of creation, even though He did not create; of absolute thought, even though He did not think.

From God, who is the source of all objects, the first act of creation, like the "*connection*" of light from G-d, is a

43. Ceylan Yasin; *DlırdarlıH ve Klışımİc*, Radikal İki; 27.05.2012; p, 9

It emerged in the form of *"overflowing outwards, into the field of appearance"* and was realised in three stages from top to bottom:

- 1) Thinking faculty (nous);
- 2) Spirit (psyche) and
- 3) Objective existence (physis).

The doctrine of Plotinus, who developed the theory of *"idea"*, which Palton characterised as the supreme and unchanging principle of the types of existence, through a new interpretation, was called Neo-Platonism (Neo-Platonism).

In ancient Anatolian-Greek thought, there was no perception of *an "unwritten"* that could mean creation out of nothing. The act of creation was explained as *the "evolution"* from *"khaos"* to *"kosmos"* through the shaping and organisation of the pre-existing.

Until the monotheistic religions, objects were formed from certain principles through *"change-transformation"*.

After the emergence of monotheistic religions, a new interpretation was brought to the problem of *"being"* in the Middle Ages: The subject of *"becoming"*, which was dealt with in the ancient Anatolian-Greek thought, was transformed into *"creation out of nothing"* by a divine power. In the process, the medieval *"theology"* *"confronted"* philosophy by bringing to the fore the phenomenon of *"creation out of nothing"*, which originated from the Socrates-Plato-Aristotelian view of the universe but was centred in a channel *"contrary"* to its source of inspiration. According to medieval theologians, there was only one reality, and that was God; *it was impossible for an object to exist before God.*

Neo-Platonism, which was inspired by Platon and developed by Plotinus in order to *"reconcile religion and philosophy"* under certain conditions, and the understanding that creation was not a *"creation out of nothing"*, but *"we did not create from the essence of God"*, was *"rejected"* by the orthodox theologians of the Middle Ages.

After the Middle Ages, the problem of creation acquired a completely different character; it was gradually "*pushed out*" of philosophy and left to the realm of metaphysics.

In Anatolian Sufism, the "*phenomenon of creation*" is neither an "*organisation of the existent*" as understood by ancient Greek-Anatolian thought, nor a "*creation out of nothing*" as understood by monotheistic religion. It is a "*transformation*" as envisaged by Neo-Platonism, which medieval orthodox theologians rejected. It is the "*visualisation*" of the divine being as a vast light. When God, overflowing out of the realm of divine existence, emerged into the realm of "*vision*" in the sensible universe, the event of creation was realised. Therefore, "*the creator and the created are one*".

According to scientific philosophy, which approaches the event of creation with the view that matter is "*prehistoric-eternal*", this issue, which is dealt with by theology, is not related to reality. Both creation and creation arise from the "*change*" of matter; there is only "*change*" at its origin.

However, the "*phenomenon of creation*" has survived to the present day as "*opposing* currents of thought", one stemming from ancient Anatolian-Greek thought and the other from monotheistic theology and Neo-Platonism.

(Tsa's Headstrong)
NEO-PLATONISTS

"God the devil,
It is the nostalgia of the impossible
God, and therefore, precisely as God, it is possible.""

Neo-Platonism developed "*in two different directions*" in the following centuries, one in the West and the other in the East: In the West, it followed two lines of development, one related to theology and the other to Christian sects. In the East, on the other hand, it was nourished by ancient Anatolian, Indian, Iranian and Asian beliefs and ideas, and spread into a movement called "Isi fe/philosophy" and its living pillar "*ta- savvuF*".

In the Anatolian Antiquity, Naturalism was not popular; there was a belief that there was no supernatural power and that the real power was "*in and through*" nature.

Later, throughout Naturalism, the admiration for natural forces "*blossomed*" into mysticism. Thus, two separate fields were formed:

1) Objective field; the universe grasped by the senses;

44. Lyotard Jean-François; *Satan Adomo* (Trans. Orçun Türkay); Cogito; Yapı Kredi Publications; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p. 117

2) The realm of belief is the realm formed by the assumption of incorporeal powers that cannot be grasped by the senses; God was the foremost of the incorporeal powers.

For example: In mythology, the gods were "*nature's g'three*" who were corporeal, but were first considered incorporeal and then materialised; in this context, concepts that were actually incorporeal were also materialised.

In the Middle Ages, the Bâtînî Philosophy, which tried to reinterpret this tendency of the early ages and put it into practice, tended to "*materialise you*" in general and objectified God as a "light" in the form of "*ash*" in particular.

In a broad sense, "*mysticism*", which is the understanding of reaching the truth by "*feeling* and *intuition*" outside the realm of reason and experiment, influenced both Western mysticism and Eastern mysticism.

Greek scholar Aphrodisius Alexander (2nd century); with his interpretations of Aristotle's philosophy, led to the birth of a new movement of thought. He concentrated his interpretations on the "*active intellect*"; he re-classified the "*active intellect*", which occupied an important place in Aristotelian philosophy, and divided it into three:

- 1) Unprocessed intellect; intellect that has the quality of a faculty; such as the ability to understand art.
- 2) Acquired reason; such as the ability to think.
- 3) Active intellect; intellect that is not peculiar to human beings, such as the intellect that comes from God.

According to him, the "*passive intellect*", the sounds made by living beings through an excitement or a design, were the new "diff"; they could not be considered a "*consciousness*" event.

Alexander's views on "active reason" led to new researches and analyses in the Middle Ages and Renaissance period.

Arius of Alexandria (280-336); "*Salutation* is a divine

"heretical" in the Christian religion, arguing that there is no being.

which is considered to be the most important institution in the world.

Arius, while defending the view that Christian beliefs should acquire a content based on the principles of reason, made use of "scientific data". According to him, faith was not an entity "created" by the human mind, but a form of "orientation" provided by "traditions and customs". Therefore, it had to be "connected" with the realities of life. Religion cannot be separated from the life of human beings; since it includes "countries that give life a vision", its "rationality" is in question. On the other hand, most of the belief data are incompatible with reason and carry a "message" that is destructive and disparaging to reason.

According to Christian beliefs, Jesus is a "divine being", the "son" of God and "dead" like God. However, this is not the truth. Jesus is also a "man". It is true that He received "commands" from God, but the idea that He has a divine "essence" is wrong. Jesus is not the son of God. He cannot be the son of God. His being the son of God "contradicts" the divinity of God.

In this context, it is also not true that "Ke'am" is God, that he has an eternal quality. The ideas put forward for the "Holy Spirit", which unite and identify Him with God and Jesus, are also not "true".

Faith is "invalid, inconsistent" as long as it "opposes" reason. Belief is nourished by emotional beings, therefore it is "incompatible"

and contradictory with the principles of reason. Since God is an eternal being of reason, His commands must also be seen as "related to reason". Even though God's creativity and limitlessness exceed the

comprehension power of the intellect, they cannot be considered "irrational". God is the "ineffable intellect"; the "Holy Spirit" is the divine spirit; God "does not have the quality of a second being" in the midst of his being. In the "Father-Son-Spirit" form adopted by the

Church, God is the "Father-Son-Spirit".

The alleged trinity is incompatible with the divine being; it "contradicts" the belief that God is one being.

The ideas of Arius also had an impact outside the Christian world:

In Anatolia and the neighbouring countries of Anatolia, *"Occult Philosophy"* was significantly influenced by Arianism. The French theologian and sage Petrus Abaelardus (1079- 1142), based on the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, introduced into Christian thought a new *"primordial principle of the alci1"*.

commented.

He entered philosophy with the interpretation of concepts: According to him, "concepts" were divided into two: universal and particular. Universal concepts were concepts that embraced the whole of a certain sphere of existence and had general validity. The concepts of universal and particular were opposed to each other in terms of *"validity and content"*; in this context, the source of all knowledge was nothing but *the "connection"* established between universals and particulars according to the principles of reason. The universals existed in the individual, in the new particular; in this respect, the real was the particular. The universals derived from the particulars; outside the particular, the universal could only exist as this *"concept"*. Particulars were the real objects we know; universal concepts were in these individual objects.

According to Abaelardus, the view that universals were divine beings was not correct: to interpret universals as real and general beings that preceded particulars was *"transcendental"*, a view that *"excluded"* particulars, that is, objects, which were real beings.

Abaelardus's taking individual objects as real and deriving universal concepts, i.e. universals, from them was an approach that preceded and originated *"Nominalism"*.

According to Abaelardus, *there was a certain "identity" of subject matter between Greek philosophy and Christianity: The triad of "Ezk-Wisdom-Goodness"*, which was at the centre of the Greek philosophical view of the universe, was transformed into the triad of *"Father-Spirit-Son"* in the Christian religion. The triad of *"Erk-Wisdom-Goodness"* also indicated the *"three qualities"* of the three divine beings in Christianity: Dile-

"ErJ", meaning "*Father*", who does what he wants, "biJgeiŋ", meaning "*Spirit*", and what was wanted was "good", i.e. the "Son".

Above all, faith had to be based on the principles of "*reason*". Although the truth may appear to be of two kinds, in essence it was "*one*". The truth revealed by God and the truth that follows the rules of reason and finds its source in reason were "*identical*".

Abaelardus opened a new "A-frontier" with his rationalist interpretations of the problems of faith, with his "*shocking*" criticisms against those who tried to solve the problems only with the data of faith, and brought a new interpretation to Aristotelianism in the Christian world.

The German theologian Albertus Magnus (1207-1280) tried to "*reconcile*" religion and philosophy by interpreting Aristotle's views according to Christian beliefs.

He entered philosophy by interpreting Aristotle's thoughts; he put forward new interpretations that could be compatible with Christian beliefs. While trying to "*emphasise*" the principles based on reason, he took care *not to "contradict"* the essence of the understanding of existence envisaged by the Christian religion *and not to "contradict"* the rules of belief proposed by the holy books.

According to him, philosophy was divided into two sections according to the nature of the subjects it contained:

1) Real philosophy analyses the entities that constitute a field that is not dependent on human existence. It is differentiated within itself according to the content of the field of being it analyses:

- a) Theology analyses the divine being and its qualities.
- b) Mathematics deals with sciences such as arithmetic, astronomy, music and geometry.
- c) Physics; sciences dealing with human beings, animals and plants. analyses.

2) Applied philosophy analyses the products of thought produced by the independent work of the faculty of understanding; such as ethics, politics, sociology, etc.

Bonaventura (1221- 1274), an Italian theologian and mystic, was the founder of a "*mystic*" doctrine of knowledge derived from Neo-Platonism.

Although he grew up in an age and environment where Aristotelian philosophy was very widespread, he was more inclined towards Neo-Platonism, which originated from Plato's views.

For Bonaventura, who tried to reconcile religion and philosophy "*thinking was equivalent to acting*".

According to him, God could be reached by passing through "*certain stages*". These stages are perceived as a three-step ladder:

- a) The highest stage; God, the universal of universals stage;
- b) The search for objects perceived in the form of divine traces.
- c) The stage of objects perceived in the form of divine images (visions).

Some of the objects are "*temporary*" and some are "*permanent*"; the temporary ones are "*outside*" the human being, related to the body. The permanent ones are related to the "inner universe" of man.

The first condition for reaching God is to "*grasp*" these traces, to "*recognise*" them. Bonaventura argues that there are three faculties in man:

- 1) "*Sensitive*" to perceive divine traces, divine images,
- 2) The "understanding" (intelligence) that enables us to arrive at the source of these grandmothers and
- 3) To see the unchanging immortal essence

Bonaventura influenced those who came after him with his "new interpretations" of the Aristotelian understanding in the search for solutions to the problems of theology, especially with Neo-Platonism.

He was a "pioneer" in the *"reconciliation"* of Christian thought.

The German cleric Thomas Müntzer (1489-1525), considered by Marxists in the XXth century as the forerunner of the struggle for a classless society, tried to *"transform the movement of religious reform into a social revolution for equality"*.

Müntzer saw the attempt to reform religion as the first sign of a political movement aimed at the establishment of a *"Kingdom of God"* that would ensure social justice against oppression and feudal exploitation. For this reason, he soon *"distanced himself"* from the Lutheran movement, which sought to *"limit" reform to "independence"* from the Roman Catholic Church. Müntzer initially *"rebelled" against* the church by following Luther's teaching, but soon parted ways. He *"opposed"* Luther's doctrine of *"justification"* through faith and *"acceptance"* of the Bible as the only source of divine truth, arguing that his religious doctrine was derived from the Holy Spirit. The revolutionary aspect of Müntzer's views was his belief, which he regarded as an enemy of Christianity, that *"world government would eventually be overthrown by God's intermediaries, the common people, and that propertyless people would fulfil God's will"*.

The propaganda activities of the members of the Anabaptist sect gathered around him among the peasants played an important role in the *"beginning of the peasant uprising"*. Müntzer's theological doctrine was based on the belief in a *"d^T1 God"* who was removed from all kinds of symbols. According to him, *"God was everything and everything was God"*. Therefore, the mediating churches had to be completely *"abolished"* and a true *"Tafli "1 KTd1J1 I"* had to be established on earth. He saw the goal of the peasant movement in which he participated as an order of *"equality and fraternity"* based on the *"right to self-determination"*.

In May 1525 he was defeated by the superior power of the princes; Müntzer, who was arrested and tortured, was arrested by the princes.

He was tried and executed at the court martial. After the bloody suppression of the peasants' wars, Müntzer's views became *"the symbol of revolutionary movements"*; in the following period, they were "reinterpreted" in terms of the Marxist understanding of history; and he was considered *"the forerunner of the struggle for a classless society, the first designer of the utopian communist society"*.

Today we know that this struggle, this design, which Müntzer realised in German soil, had been realised by Sheikh Bedrettin (1358-1420) in Anatolian soil about 100 years before him. *"Behead those who attribute injustices in this world to the next world", *!#!-* to Müntzer, who said: *'everything but the lips of the wife goes everywhere'. to be a partner"*, Bedrettin led the way.

The Italian philosopher and naturalist Bruno (1548-1600), inspired by Neo-Platonism and Epicureanism, brought a *"new interpretation to the questions of existence"*: He defended *the "identity" of the universe and God*.

Bru- no, who began philosophy by analysing the natural sciences, had two subjects on which he focused heavily: *"God and the universe"*.

According to Bruno, the universe was *"infinite and vast"* because it was identical with God, *and there was "no you"*. In the infinite universe, there were *"countless Gilnesh Systems"* moving on their own orbits with their own satellites.

The particular objects within the universe as a whole were in a constant state of *"change"*; they were not born, nor did they disappear, but were *"merged and separated"* at different rates. According to him, the whole universe consisted of the smallest elements, which he called *"monads"*. All the elements in the universe, the objects composed of these elements, were *"alive"*; they were connected to an *"i/- bone"* identical with the universe. Therefore, the universe as a whole was also a *"series"*; what gave it life was *the "universe-set spirit"*, which was perceived as *the "living substance"*. This essence had an effect on all objects; it was the quality of *"intellect"* that resided in matter and guided it.

This intellect affected all objects not equally but according to *their "own stages of existence"*. For this reason, objects acquired different qualities according to the "proportion" of *the "intellect"* they were affected by.

The universe is not the result of an external force, but *"its own essence"*.

"by necessity" was moving.

All the objects in the universe, which is the developed and manifested form of the divine being, were organised according to successive *"successor steps"*, which were in *"unity and harmony"* from the bottom to the top. The power that harmonised these levels of being was the mind of this highest "organism", that is, the mind of the universe; *"the nature of nature was God"*.

In all objects, *"countries"*; in all events, *"causes"* were at work. Aristotle's views on causes were not convincing; there were not four causes, as he said, but two causes, one of which was *"constructive"* and the other *"directive"*. In fact, both of these two causes *were apparent*: Since there could be no movement without an impulse, the efficient cause *"included"* the directive cause.

Again, Aristotle argued that matter and form were not *"causes"* but the principles of being. Form was a state of matter; matter was a power in constant motion. All types of being emerged from this power as particulars.

On the other hand, Aristotle's view of the Earth as the centre of the universe was also *"contrary to the facts of nature"*. Because there were countless solar systems in the universe.

Bruno was *"condemned to death by licking"* by the judges of the Inquisition because of his ideas.

The German philosopher Böhme (1575-1624); existence and becoming, He defended the view that it originated *from a "divine essence"*.

According to him, in the beginning God was in *"silence, darkness and rest"*: This was because He existed as *"God the Father"*. From the abyss where *"God the Father"* was, an opposite "light" was born, exploded. This light was

"*God the Son*". In parallel with the spread of the divine light, *the "Holy Spirit"* was born from the "*Father-Son*" duo: Thus, in the context of the "*Father-Son-Spirit*" trinity, in their integrity, they gained "*unity-reality*".

The "*fi uh*" in the trinity is the "*divine ray*" endowed with ruling, knowing, comprehending, understanding power. This "*divine ray*" pervaded all living creatures. *The "soul"* in the person, *the* being called "*divine ray*" that realises the act of thinking, was in reality "*Father-God*". The self-knowledge of the individual, the comprehension of the universe by showing oneself as a "*tank*" could be achieved by the light of this spirit, and the light of this spirit was "*God the Son*".

What the thinkers of the period of the "*Church Fathers*", the first stage of medieval philosophy, did was to turn the basic principles of Christianity into a "*rational system*".

In order to realise this aim, they made use of Ancient Greek philosophy and especially Platon; they applied these ideas to Christianity. Even though the system they came up with seemed to have a rational structure, "*the valid criterion was still faith*".

In the VIIIth-IXth centuries, Christianity acquired the character of an established "*doctrine*"; the formalisation of principles had come to an "*end*"; the debates on them *had "ceased"* and they began to be regarded as "*propositions*" whose truth was beyond doubt.

The thinkers of the Scholastic period, which lasted from the IXth century until the end of the XIVth century, accepted the "*correctness*" of Christian teaching as theologians. Theology became the aim of the thinkers using philosophy. When philosophical conclusions contradicted theology, *they were "set aside"*, or a "*separation*" was made between rational truth and religious truth. Thus, Scholastic philosophy is the endeavour to "*harmonise*" the truths of reason and faith, and to "*verify*" the truths of faith from a rational point of view. The basis of this endeavour is "*church dogmas*". Where this could not be achieved, the truths of belief were claimed to be "*transcendental*" to human reason. For this reason

In scholastic philosophy, everything is deduced "*by deduction*" from the dogmas of religion, which are believed as immutable truths. This attitude led to concentrating on the "*supernatural*" field instead of dealing with nature. In this endeavour, the main rational tool was "logic".

Scholastic philosophy is divided into three periods:

1. The period lasted from the IXth century to the XIIth century; the influence of the Church Fathers was very strong; Platonism, Neo-Platonism and Augustinianism were the sources. Among the thinkers of this period, Roscelinus and Abaelardus were considered heretics, while Anselmus was considered a harmonious philosopher.

2. Period; XIII. century; based on Aristotle; Thomas of Aquino is the most brilliant thinker of this period.

3. Period; XIVth century; closing period; Although Thomas' views were adopted as the official doctrine of the Dominican order and he was elevated to sainthood, a movement of thought against Thomasism emerged immediately after his death. This movement was especially popularised by thinkers affiliated with the Franciscan order. Among them, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura and especially Duns Scotus criticised Thomasianism and caused the division of Christian thought into two schools, Thomasian and anti-Thomasian. This century was a period in which the Franciscans overshadowed Thomasianism. At the same time, this history, which was fundamentally tied to Augustinus and his Platonic origins, initiated a limited departure from Aristotelianism. One of the attitudes of the Franciscans that led to the closure of Scholasticism was their treatment of the mystical, emotional and actional aspects of religion: This attitude led them to regard the will as more important than the intellect.

(İyilikle Kötülüğün Diyalektiği) ZERDUŞT DİNİ

"For Spinoza, in order for knowledge to be able to cope with our captive moods (...) it must itself produce an even stronger effect on us than these;...⁴⁵

One of the most important sources of Anatolian Sufism is Zoroastrianism of Iranian origin. Zoroaster (628-551 B.C.), who is accepted to have lived in almost the same period as Buddha and Pythagoras, founded the religion known by his name on the territory of present-day Iran and Eastern Anatolia. Zoroastrianism, which continued its existence in the process of "evolution" from polytheistic religions to monotheistic religions, was either the "direct" source of the formation of the Bâtınî Philosophy in Anatolia, or it "intermediated" the beliefs and ideas coming from the Anatolian Antiquity, Central Asian origin Shamanism and Southeast Asian origin Buddhism. He transformed these values into an "essence-form" that Anatolian Bâtîmîs could assimilate.

Therefore, Zoroaster did not destroy the polytheistic religion of Ancient Iran but, rather, he did not seek Ahura Mazda, immortality and the end.

45. Fransez, Moris; *Splroza'nu Too sufAlcılı İnançtın İranç Ak- la*; Yol Yayıncılık Tic. Ltd. Şti.; İstanbul- 2004; p,95

He placed it at the centre of the land of "*truth and righteousness*", where unlimited happiness prevailed. His aim was to "*remould*" the religion of ancient Iran on the basis of social and economic values.

According to Zoroaster, "*good*" and "*evil*" could not come from the same source; therefore he attributed good to Ahura Mazda and evil to Eh- rimen. He designed a constant "*struggle*" between them; in the end "*good*" would win the fight.

The duty of human beings was not to "*cry*" to God for good and evil, but to "*join*" the favourable side. Those who sought goodness in the soul and evil in matter were also "*mistaken*"; goodness and evil pervaded both "*souls*" and "*matter*". The collision was between good and evil, light and darkness, sky and earth.

Ahura Mazda was the only deity to be worshipped; *he was the creator of the heavens and the earth, in other words, of the objective and non-objective worlds*". *He was the source of darkness and light, the creator of universal ethics, the centre of nature and the "judge" of the whole world.*

As a "*proof*" of the transition to life in the process of evolving into the monotheistic period, the Gathas *do not "encounter"* the polytheistic elements of the Veda faith. For example, there is no "*goddess*" sharing Ahura Mazda's sovereignty. According to the later Avesta texts, Ahura Mazda is surrounded by six celestial beings called "*Amesha Spenta*" (Beneficent-Immortal).

According to the Gathas, Ahura Mazda was the father of Spenta Mainyu (*Good huh*) as well as the Asha Vhishta (*Righteousness-Perfect Order*), Vohu Manah (*Good Alal*) and Spenta Ar- maiti (*Benevolent-BondMH*) of the Amesha Spenta. The other three Amesha Spenta, the Kshathra Vairya (*Supreme Sovereignty*), the Haurvatat (*Perfect Order*) and the Ameratatat (*Immortality*) were nothing but the "*realisation*" of the qualities originating from Ahu- ra Mazda.

In Zoroastrianism, "the same *ethical rules*" were valid for gods and humans. The Amesha Spentas, who reflected the functioning of the divine order, "*embodied*" the qualities of which they were the bearers, *bringing* the world of Ahura Mazda and the world of His followers *"closer together"*.

Ehri- men, who symbolises evil in opposition to the Wise God, constitutes the "two sides" of Zoroastrianism. Those who follow Ehrimen are also considered "evil" because they make this choice of their own free will.

According to Zarathustra, in the beginning, "*two souls*" confront each other in an environment where the freedom to choose between "life and *non-life*" is decisive. This first choice is also the source of the principles of "*good*" and "*evil*". The fact that Ahura Mazda "*created*" both souls, which turn into two opposing principles by their own will and decision, proves the "*monotheistic*" character of Zoroastrian religion despite its "*dualism*".

The belief that the Wise God will overcome the evil spirit through the Amesha Spentas signifies the end of "dualism".

This, the evolution from polytheism to monotheism, is the "*most important transformation*" that Zarathustra made. In the beginning, the world was divided into two "*spheres*", one under the sovereignty of "*his work*" and the other under the sovereignty of "*evil'ûn'ûn*": Every human being had to make a "choice" between them; he could, of his own free will, choose either God the Wise or the sphere under His sovereignty.

or Ehrimen, who ruled in the Land of Lies.

The reward of the righteous man was "*eternal righteousness and immortality*". The man who sided with the Lie, on the other hand, would not only be judged by the Wise God, but would also be "*condemned*" by "*his own conscience*".

This form of human existence after death fuelled the creation of the "*fiction*" of Heaven and Hell in Christianity and Islam.

In the context of the doctrine of the afterlife, the judgement of Ahura Mazda

After this, the good souls would be sent to "the principle of *eternal happiness* and work" and the bad souls to "the principle of *fear and darkness*". On the other hand, Zarathustra states that there is a "*final home in creation*". At this point, Ehrimen would be destroyed, the world would be reconstructed perfectly, and the good people who settled in this new world would live in "*eternal bliss*".

This approach, which feeds the understanding of the Messiah-Mahdi in the last monotheistic religions, has been somewhat more muted within the scope of the "*Resurrection Doctrine*", which was put forward in the later periods of Zoroastrian religion.

In the context of this doctrine, world history is divided into four periods, each lasting three thousand years:

In the time before time, there is Hormuz (the new name of Ahura Mazda), who stands in the light, and Ehri- men, who stands in darkness beneath him. At the end of the first three thousand years, Ehrimen attacked Hormuz; Hormuz recited the most sacred of prayers, the Ahura Vairya; alarmed, Ehrimen was swallowed up in the pit of Hell, where he spent the second three thousand years.

During this period, Hormuz did not idle: He set about creating the universe; first he created the "*universe of spirits*", including the Amesha Spentas, and then its objective counterparts, the "*Sky, water, Earth, plants*, the first Ox and the *first man Gayomart*". Then He gave two options to the transcendental spirits that would appear in human bodies in the future: Either to remain forever in their "*pre-birth*" state, or to "*take on a body*" and come to earth to help Free-Muslim in his fight against Ehrimen.

In the meantime, Ehrimen went to work: He created six evil jinns and an "*objective*" universe with a structure opposite to that of Free-Muslims.

At the end of the second three thousand years, Ehrimen attacked the Sky and spread "evil" in Hormuz's world. From the corpse of the first human he killed, "*Gayomar*", the human race and metals were derived, and from the corpse of "iik Ö z", animals and plants.

In the third period, even if Ehrimen dominates the world, he cannot continue to do so; Hormuz considers him a "trap"; Ehri- men prepares his own destruction with his own hands.

The last three-thousand-year period begins with the birth of Zarathustra; at the end of each thousand years of this period, a descendant of Zarathustra will appear as his "ahh" and undertake the task of saving the world.

The third and last saviour, Saoshyana, will carry out the final judgement, distribute the "drink of deathlessness" and show the way to a "new world".

The religion founded by Zoroaster spread to the south and west after his death; in the meantime, naturally, some values characteristic of the old polytheistic religion were revived; the old gods and goddesses were connected to "worship".

After the conquest of Parsa (*Persepolis*) by Alexander the Great, Hellenic culture began to exert its influence in Iran. When this influence turned into domination, Iran's own religion was pushed aside.

In the period following 224 AD, a revival began to be observed again. With the adoption of Zoroastrianism as the official religion by the Sassanid Dynasty (224-651 A.D.), Zoroastrianism once again established its dominance.

After the spread of Islam in Iran, Zoroastrian religion had the opportunity to continue its existence for about three hundred years within certain limits.

In the VIIIth-Xth centuries, due to religious persecution, Zoroastrians migrated to various parts of India, especially Bombay. In the XIXth century, this community, known as the Parsis, re-established contact with the Gebris, the last Zoroastrian community in Iran. The Parsis and the Gebris can be regarded as the modern-day representatives of the Zoroastrian religion.

Mazdeism is the religion of the benevolent god Ahura Mazda and predates Zoroastrianism:

1) Early Mazdeism: It proposed a trinity of gods (Abu- *ra Mazda*, *Mithra* and *Anabita*). Around this triad were secondary gods, spirits and demons.

For example, there were six spirits gathered under the name Amešas Spen- tas, meaning "*immortal powers*":

Behmen (*Good D'ûshin*), Erdibihisht
{ *Good Virtue*}, Shahrivar (*Good
Empire*); Spendarmidh (*Good Sunken*)
Hurdad (*Good Sogm*) and Murdad
(***Good Immortality***).

2) Second Mazdeism: From this polytheistic Iranian mytho-logic Zarathustra created a new Mazdeism that would bring about economic and social reform. This was Zoroastrianism.

3) Third Mazdeism: After Zarathustra, Mazdeism reverted to the old polytheism and was filled with empty beliefs; this was called Parsism.

It was brought to life as a "re-form" of Zoroastrianism by the Iranian Mani (216-276): Manichaeism (Manicheism) was the religion that was created by melting Jesus, Buddha and Zoroastrian thought in a "*melting pot*", taking the "rational" aspects of all previous beliefs and religions.

In essence, Manichaeism was a "*moral*" doctrine that took its source from goodness and beauty. According to this doctrine, people should live in society:

- 1) Live in brotherhood and peace;
- 2) They should enjoy the world's goods in common;
- 3) should not run for excessive gain and
- 4) He had to live on his own labour.

On the individual level;

- 1) The mouth should not utter evil and filthy words;
- 2) The hand should refrain from actions that harm goodness, and
- 3) The heart must be free from carnal desires.

According to Mani, the structure of the beings in the universe was based on the *"opposition"* of good and evil (*light and darkness*). By perceiving the *"unity"* in this opposition, Mani was approaching *"dialectical science"*; moreover, he was *"reproducing"* Heraclitus when he stated that the universe and all the beings in the universe were the field of the *"sumsmic struggle"* of this opposition.

Mani's thoughts were expressed in the aphorisms in his illustrated manuscript called *"Erjeng"*. His main topic was the *"opposition"* between good and evil. The human being, who resembled the universe, was the *"battlefield"* of good and evil; for this reason, good and evil were *"principles of existence"* and had different characteristics beyond them. The luminous spirit, the symbol of goodness, was the reflection of *"light and g'ûze11ic"*, while the darkness, the symbol of evil, was the reflection of *"body, matter and evil"* in the sensible universe.

In this context, man was a whole composed of body and soul, in other words *"light and darkness"*. The body was the symbol of *"evil"* and the soul was the symbol of *"goodness"*. The source of all human actions was the battle between these two principles. In order for a human being to attain happiness, he had to achieve *"balance"* between these two opposing forces. When balance was achieved, conflict ended; the phase of *"reconciliation"* began; from the phase of reconciliation, *"unity"* was achieved, and *"stagnation"*, which formed the basis of happiness, was attained.

Man's overcoming evil and being happy depended to some extent on his own will; if he could establish a *"balance"* between two opposing forces by using his will, the path to the happiness he longed for

would open up. Balance, i.e. unity, can only be achieved in an atmosphere of deep thought,

It could be provided with "*heart knowledge and feeling*". Knowledge of the heart;

- 1) Self-knowledge;
- 2) To comprehend the qualities of the two opposing forces in conflict within its own structure and
- 3) Competence could be achieved by acquiring the production of thought necessary for maturity.

This was a work of "*intuition*"; the primary source of intuition was "*love*", which has a power superior to reason:

- 1) Uninterested in transient beings;
- 2) Avoiding falsehood;
- 3) Loving the good and the beautiful;
- 4) Humble, affectionate;
- 5) Not gossiping, not interfering;
- 6) Do not look down on others;
- 7) Helpful people could "*discover*" the way to "*unity*".

Manicheanism "*deeply*" influenced Anatolian Bâtinism in general and Alevism-Bektashism in particular. It became the "*primary source*" of Alevi traditions and customs and the Alevi-Bektashi ethical principles based on them. By feeding on this source, that is, by evolving the Manichean trinity of "mouth-hand-soul" into the trinity of "*e/-diJ-her*"; By transforming "*love*", which was also emphasised in Manicheanism as the creative root of intuition and knowledge of the heart, into "*love*", which is the source of both the attainment of God in the field of belief and the source of brotherhood, reconciliation, peace and equality in the field of thought, they brought an "*ethical fe/se/wife*" to life on a social scale in Anatolia.

They emerged as reformers of Zoroastrianism and Manicheanism.

The Iranian Mazdek (?-535), who advocated blood and the *"common division of all the deprived"*, transformed the religious beliefs of the Iranians into a *"vulgar nationalist"* belief.

At the time Mazdek lived, Iranian society was divided into two main classes: the *"poor peasants"* who produced and the *"nobles"* who lived off them. The nobles oppressed and exploited the people, leaving them in hunger and poverty. It was in such an environment that Mazdak emerged; he began to spread the message that the Zoroastrian priests were on the *"wrong"* path and that they were *"enabling"* the poor people. For this reason, Mazdek concentrated his views on issues such as *"umfim, tlikeÖin, governance and social equality"*.

According to him, the earth was a living space open to the *"common"* utilisation of all human beings; in this living space, those who worked *would "live"* and those who did not *would "disappear"*. Society was a *"communal"* organisation formed by individuals; therefore, all social goods were *"common"*, and ownership of property was *"separated from nature"*. In society, no one had the *"right"* or *"authorisation"* to oppress anyone, to abolish or restrict their freedom.

The institution of the family was also *"unnatural"*, the woman was not a *"slave"* of the man, she was a *"free"* human being; therefore, there was nothing *"unnatural"* about the woman becoming a *"partner"* of her own will and behaving as she wished.

This understanding, which developed as a result of the revitalisation of *"rose/ üomilnaf"* values from the past historical process in which private property, classes and the state *"did not exist"*, where man could not *"dominate"* woman and woman could not *"dominate"* man, with the motive of protecting woman, led to a *"deviation"*, an *"error"* in Mazdek with the emergence of *"basket"* of male values in an *"atavistic"* society. In this *"deviation"* or *"illusion"*, the distinction between women and goods was *"erased"*, and the use of the female body was added as a *"product"* to the labour products consumed.

As for Mazdek's view of the universe, according to him, there were two universes, one "higher" and the other "lower". The powers governing these two universes were divided into three groups: four, seven and twelve. If these powers were gathered in a person, that person would reach "*unity*"; he would rise to a competent and mature state; he would become a "*citizen of the higher universe*". Such a person would become a "*servant*" of society; he would save the people from evil, oppression by rulers, exploitation and robbery; he would eliminate inequality.

Mazdekism was a source of "*inspiration*" in the structuring and shaping of the "*educational teaching*" of Anatolian Alevism; in this context, it "mediated" the worldisation of the pole in the channel of the journey of seyrü süluk, the understanding of Ene1 Hak, the glorification of the virtuous, the perfect human being, the perfect human being, in order to "*help*" the establishment of a perfect society.

The dreams of the poor peasantry, on which Mazdek leaned, were transformed into a "*political 'utopia' that also postponed socialism*" in the Alevism of the Anatolia; they were concretised as a "*vision of a perfect society*" that would realise the salvation of humanity.

After his death, Mazdek's "*vulgar nationalist*" revolution spread far and wide and lasted for about five hundred years.

Babek (?-838), who became the head of the Mazdekists in 816 A.D., further developed Mazdakism; he revolted against Arab rule in Azerbaijan and established a strong sovereignty.

(Philosophy of Relief from Suffering)

BUDISM

"The development of the soul has taken a very long time, and it is still developing."⁴⁶

Let us now turn to the Far East Asian source of Anatolian Bâtinism: In no other land has the "*supernatural*" been analysed as much as in India; its basic beliefs, especially the "*transmigration of souls*", have been "observed" in almost all other religions of the world.

The most advanced religions, which include these primitive beliefs, are unique to India; even the simplest beliefs have a "philosophical value" in this land.

The distinctive features of Indian religious philosophy can be summarised under three headings:

1) The essence under the surface cannot be taught or learnt.

2) Salvation is individual; one can only obtain the essence that will ensure one's own salvation through one's own contemplation. Individual contemplation, later also known as "mysticism".

46. Jung, Carl G.; İnsan ve Semboller (Translated by Ali Nahit Babaoğlu); Okuyan Us; 4th Edition; İstanbul- 2009; p.: 82)

of mysticism. For this reason, India is considered the true homeland of mysticism.

3) All Indian religions derive from each other.

According to the records of researchers, the Veda religion was dominant in India around four thousand BC. The rules-principles of the Veda religion, which was the source of Brahmanism, were organised in four books; more precisely, each of these four books was a chapter, and all of them constituted the "*sacred book of homework*". In these chapters, called "flash?", there were narratives about the "autobiographies" of blessed bards or heroes who lived in the past.

The Veda faith recognised a single and great god called "*Deva*". This god was the symbol of the heavens and the divine realm.

In the course of time, thirty-three assistant gods were added to the great god named "*Deva*". "*De va*" belief was based on the concept of "*sacrifice*": The existence of the tradition of "*human sacrifice*" to God proves that Hindistan was living in the "lower barbaric age" when the Veda belief was dominant. Even if it does not coincide historically with the period in which the famous sacred myth of Abraham giving up the sacrifice of his son Ishmael in favour of a ram descending from the sky, which is the source of the Feast of Sacrifice in our country, it at least coincides in terms of the "*human condition*".

In the Veda faith, the oldest polytheistic religion of India, the forces of nature such as air, water, fire, sun, etc. were considered "*gods*". The ceremonies organised to win the favour and help of these gods were led by Brahmins; there was no specific structure for worship; ceremonies were held within the family or in the countryside; sacrificial meat was consumed with "wine"; religious songs were sung and religious dances were performed. These ceremonies were performed under Brahmanism, Buddhism, Ba-

ti, it spread towards the Anatolian Alevism and changed the religious ritual of Anatolian Alevism.

"directly" or "indirectly".

Brahmanism, which took its source from the Veda religion, became dominant between 2500 and 1500 BC. In Brahmanism, "atman" meant spirit and "brahman" meant matter. Atman was "subject/reality" and brahman was "objective reality". Absolute reality was "Atman-Brahman", i.e. the "identity" between the two.

According to the sacred myth, Brahman was the sole creator of the universe; he dwelt at home on Mount Meru: He first created the female deity on the island of Bhucani; from the three eggs of this deity, three manifestations emerged: "*Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva*".

With the loss of the dominance of the naturalist philosophy, nature began to be perceived as "nam evan", which was believed to carry a superhuman power. People perceived that nature functioned in a certain order. Gradually, they began to believe that it was governed by a power that set immutable laws. Therefore, the gods in their mythology were nothing but "*personified*" parts of nature.

In other words, polytheism was essentially a system of "*multiplied*" monotheism; that is, the one nature-god took on "*various names in various guises*". This situation, which is more obvious and apparent in Indian designs, is "*hidden in Greek-Main-Flood designs because of the predominance of anthropomorphism.*" With this approach, it can be said that Indian polytheism is the "multiple manifestations" of a single god.

The trinity of "*Brahma-Vishnu-Ishva*" in Brahmanism constituted the Eastern source of the trinity of "God-universe-human" on which the Bâtinism of the Anatolia based its view of the universe. In the Hindu view, all nature was abstracted as a divine "one power" under the name of Brahman; this "*one power*" appeared to human beings in the form of three different gods:

- 1) Brahma; the creator (TEZ); the author of creation;

therefore symbolised the past. The first-order personification of "*Brahman*"; the most abstract god; the proof of the evolution to monotheism. The personification of Brahman, which encompasses matter independent of human consciousness, and "*Atman*", which encompasses the psychic structure, the soul, that constitutes human consciousness.

2) Shiva: destroyer (ANTITHESIS); destroys while destroying; spends all his efforts to destroy the universe that Vish- nu is trying to protect; in this context he symbolises burning-destruction; when necessity arises, he may appear in the form of a demon or a prophet.

3) Vishnu; protector (SYNTHESIS); protects the universe created by Brahma; in this context he symbolises the eternal. In order to protect the universe, he is in a constant fight with the demons; when the necessity arises, he comes to the world in the form of a prophet under the name of "*Krishna*"; in other words, in a sense, he becomes the "*Mahdi*". He makes various "*a vatara*" (descents to the earth) in order to make better development and improvement; in a way, he is the appearance of the one God in the di- yalectic triad; each time he descends to the earth, he restores the disturbed order in the desired or nature-appropriate way. shna" teaches people to love nature, because nature is a divine structure. Until Krishna, Indians believed that Ind- ra, the god of rain, made it rain. Krishna disagreed and said that rain is a natural phenomenon; he explained that the sun first draws up the waters of the earth and then brings them down again. With this teaching Krishna was approaching prophecy rather than deity; he was acting as the "messenger" of nature, which was perceived as the true god.

As can be seen, this sacred trinity in the Indian design is the manifestations of "*Nature Brahman*" or the "inch separate *appearance*" of the personified nature in the identity of Brahman. The universe was formed in such a dialectical process: One creates

(Brahma); one destroys (Shiva); one develops (Vishnu). This design reflects the *"natural dialectic"*. In the Trinity there is *"unity in three"* or *"multiplicity in alertness"*. For what appears in all three is *"absolute being"*.

Everything is *"natural"* (Creator-Brahma); *"lasts"* (Protector Vishnu) and *"passes away"* (Destroyer Shiva).

According to the Brahmins, the *"soul"*, i.e. *"glass"*, was eternal. The soul could only move and exercise will; this was possible only when the soul appeared in the *"human form"*. The soul entered into a life experience called *"kaman"*, which would carry this mould, the *"cage"* called the body. Finally, it was purified and freed from its mould and united with the great being called *"Absolute Brah- ma"*.

Brahma wanted to create a very good and beautiful but *"immaterial"* world. Shiva opposed this and tried his best to materialise His immaterial world. Because he was of the opinion that there could not be a good world; he thought that happiness could be gained by making an effort, and that this *could be achieved* in an *"evil world"*.

With the evolution of Brahmanism, Buddhism was born. The first form of Buddhism was a *"childish"* thought: People were unhappy because they could not get what they wanted; they would be happy *if they "stopped wanting"*; in order not to suffer, one should *not "want"* anything.

This philosophy of easy happiness later turned into a *"materialistic and godless"* belief: There was an uncreated and imperishable *"first matter"*; this first matter *"mechanically"* formed the universe and everything universal; everything was born, lived and died; the universe *"evolved and will evolve forever"*.

A similar approach is observed in Anatolian Sufism: The earth, which is believed to be a place of evil and evil behaviour, is perceived as *"D'unya"*; in order to attain eternal happiness, it is necessary to renounce the *"world"*.

According to the sacred myth attributed to Buddha, he lived in the "eyes" of thirty-three Veda gods. Then a revelation came to him; he realised that he must come down to earth and decided to be born "in human flesh": He took on the appearance of a "feyaz I'i1" descending from the sky to the earth, selling light, and entered the womb of the "expectant mother" through her right flank. The mother conceived Buddha in the light that descended from the heavens without suffering any "contamination".

When the time expired and the pains increased, the mother went out into the countryside; clinging to a "tree" she gave birth to the Buddha without suffering, for her mother Maya had been "midwived" by the gods. The Buddha, who began to walk as soon as he was born, took "seven steps in four directions". As soon as he opened his eyes to the world, his wife, horse and charioteer were also born. Seven days after Buddha was born, his mother died.

The religion founded by Buddha emerged as a "mixture" of Indian beliefs: The way of life of the Indian people, their view of the universe, their understanding of morality, their idea of happiness, their sense of righteousness and their view of society were exhibited in all their details.

According to Buddhism, man was a being of "purification": Happiness, greatness, immortality, righteousness, wisdom, etc. depended on this purification.

Purification meant to transcend oneself, to rise above sensible beings, to remain a will in order to be free from the passions of the body and the painful and distressing effects of life.

In the Buddha's view of life there were "*four absolute truths*". These were;

- 1) The first truth: suffering;
- 2) The second truth: desires and longings;
- 3) The third truth: liberation from suffering, suppression of all kinds of desires, elimination of all kinds of passions;

4) Fourth truth: purification. There were also eight ways of purification. These were;

- a) Seeing rightly;
- b) right thinking;
- c) To speak right;
- d) Living right;
- e) Having the right attitude and showing the right behaviour;
- f) Having the right aim and making the right effort;
- g) Having the right memory and
- h) To turn in the right direction.

The purified person was freed from the "*sovereignty*" of the body and found the way to "*happiness in the light*" of the soul.

In order for purification to be realised, "*two paths had to be abandoned and three paths had to be overcome*":

1) The path of abstinence was the first education; it taught to be bound to certain conditions, to get rid of the influence of the environment, and to recognise oneself. Despite these characteristics, this path was inconsistent, inadequate; it could not provide the desired maturity and sublimity: The smallest deviation would humiliate man.

2) The path of pleasure was the source of all evils, inferiorities, abominations, etc.; this path separates the person from the self; it leads to the abyss of unhappiness; it prevents maturity; it ensured the captivity of the soul.

3) The middle way was the way to the truth, which was reached by realising the inadequacy of the path of introspection and abandoning the path of pleasure. The middle way was the way that enlightened the human soul, opened the eyes and illuminated the interior. It was the path of serenity, inspiration, self-knowledge and understanding the meaning of immortality. It was the path that led the person to Nirvana, the "*eightfold*" path, which was found by the superior power called "*Tathagata*": The eight stages of the middle way were listed as follows:

- a) Right understanding;

- b) Right behaviour;
- c) Right judgement;
- d) Right action;
- e) Right speech;
- f) Right endeavour
- g) Right thinking and
- h) Correct recollection.

The nirvana reached after passing through these stages was "existence in non-existence". In order to reach nirvana, it was necessary to dissolve all ties related to the body and to get rid of passions. Whatever connected the person to life was "painful". There were twelve reasons for this:

- 1) Ignorance;
- 2) Habit;
- 3) Consciousness;
- 4) The forehead and torso;
- 5) Six senses
- 6) Do not touch
- 7) Interest
- 8) Desire
- 9) Greed
- 10) Individual becoming
- 11) Worldly becoming;
- 12) Death and decay.

These causes, from the first to the last, "*gave birth*" to each other, *there* was a connection between them that ensured their existence. It was impossible for a person who was attached to any, some or all of these causes to attain immortality, happiness, maturity and purification. These causes had five sources related to the life of the body and soul:

- 1) Passion;
- 2) Design;
- 3) Orientation
- 4) Knowledge and
- 5) Body.

On the other hand, there were also conditions to save the person from the pain and anxiety caused by these negative situations: All of these conditions were related to "*will*". Therefore, the first thing to do was to "*eliminate*" the tendencies based on the will.

Buda states that people who adopt these absolute truths, which are perceived as facts, and fulfil their requirements can reach the "*Arhat*" stage. The person who reaches this stage becomes perfect, mature and superior.

According to the belief of Buddhism, the soul of living beings comes into the world "*permanently*" and eventually reaches perfection (*Nirvana doctrine*). He who gives up the desire to attain happiness lives in "*happiness*". The soul that reaches perfection is "*free from suffering*". The suffering soul, on the other hand, "*perpetuates*" suffering by passing from body to body. The end of this suffering can only be realised *through* "*enlightenment and education*". The enlightened soul can pass to Nirvana; the soul's transmigration "*ends*" and the soul is freed from suffering and becomes comfortable.

As can be seen, the distinctive feature of Indian philosophy is that it shows the perfection of the human being as a "*purification*". Purification means that the human being is freed from all worldly ties and brings himself to a state of pure will. Man is a being of "*longing and futurity*". Positive and negative sources of influence "*prevent*" man from returning to himself, from grasping the essence that embodies his own self; they make him an extroverted being, distant from himself. The human being manages to stay away from all inhibiting factors.

If it can, it gains the possibility of "*self-knowledge*".

In Indian thought, self-knowledge depends on "*taking* all emotional tendencies, external influences, bodily movements and actions *under control and emerging as an absolute being of will*".

The purification developed by the Buddha is the negation of the body by bringing it under the control of the will. The self-negating human being reaches "*van f in non-existence*". By transforming into the state of "*heir in non-existence*", man gets rid of the sovereignty of the body and "*grasps non-existence*".

This view later influenced all Sufi movements; it enabled the interpretation of man as a being of "**will**" **and** "*spirit*". The body was impermanent (mortal), whereas the soul was permanent (*balci*), immortal, divine.

The liberation of the soul from the "*captivity*" of the body depended on its freedom from passions, tendencies, and longings for transient objects under the influence of the will.

In Anatolian Sufism, what the Buddha called "purification", the attainment of existence in non-existence, was transformed into "*death before death*", which was attained by passing through the stages of "*abandonment*".

In the Buddha's teaching, the purified is carried to "Nirvana"; in Anatolian Sufism, the one who "*dies **before** dying*" rises to the point of Ene1 Hak, that is, to "*immortality*".

According to Buddha, the person who "*disappears*" in the presence of Nirvana reaches happiness and eternity; in other words, a "**forest**" person is a saint. Similarly, in Anatolian Sufism, a person who "*dies before death*" is deified.

As for the Buddha's view of the universe, an approach similar to the "*atom*" theory of ancient Anatolian-Greek thought is dominant.

The emphasis on "*Arıwnayu*" and its connection with values such as wisdom, virtue and maturity are identical with the issues emphasised by the ancient Yu- nan thinkers.

His opposition to behaviours related to pleasure, especially the Antist-

henes' (445-365 BC) conception of "morality" can be regarded as a forerunner.

The view of Antisthenes is based on the "*contradictory and unjust behaviour*" he observed in the social structure. He tried to create a system of thought that would show the way to a happier and more humane life. He believed that happiness is based on moral virtue and that virtue can be overcome through teaching.

While teaching people to be virtuous, he divided objects into two:

- 1) Assets belonging to the external world include private property, sensory pleasures and other pleasures.
- 2) The things belonging to the inner world of man include truth and knowledge of the human soul.

Antisthenes argued that the material side of man, which can easily seduce him, should be suppressed, and that it is necessary to accept "*sadness and zilûnsel pain*" to help investigate the richness of the soul.

The view of "*existence in ẒoMukta*" was widely "*accepted*" in the hetero-dox background of the last monotheistic religion and in Anatolian Bâtîniîsm. The concept of "*Öi'ûms'ûzluk*" became one of the main problems of Anatolian Sufism in particular.

Buddha's problem of purification turned into the problem of "*abandonment*" in Anatolian Sufism. Abandonment means "*to be free*" from all attachments and worldly desires as long as one lives.

In Alevism-Bektashism, being free from one's passions and temporary desires is perceived as "*abandonment*". There are three types of abandonment:

- a) Abandonment of the world; the stage of not being attached to the world, which is perceived as temporary, and the blessings of the world;
- b) Abandonment of the hereafter, which is perceived as temporary like this world, and the stage of not being attached to the happiness of Paradise;
- c) Abandonment: Abandonment of the hereafter and Paradise beyond this world, which is perceived as temporary and abandoned.

The stage in which there is no existence other than the light of **God** in one's essence.

In Alevism-Bektashism, the three abandonments mean that everything begins with "light" and ends with "light".

In conclusion, the Buddhist view of life, which can be defined as "a philosophy *that adopts the principle of getting rid of suffering*", can be summarised with the proposition that "*All existence is one being*". This understanding is embodied in Anatolian Sufism in the form of "*unity of being-unity of being*".

The Indian thought that grounded Buddha's views also influenced the ancient Greek-Anatolian philosophy through Orpheus and Pythagoras.

When the Buddhist doctrine of "*Mahayana*" was established in the early years of Christianity, the individualistic Buddhism of the early ages was called "*Hayanaya*". In other words, the Buddhist doctrine was divided into two:

1) Hayanaya was based on individual salvation; Nirvana meant the merging and annihilation of the individual "I" and the universe, i.e. "*absolute non-existence*"; scientifically interpreted, it was a kind of "*metaphysical nihilism*" (supernatural non-existence). In Alevism-Bektashism, this understanding corresponds to the last stage of the Four Doors and Forty Makami-teachings; it is perceived as a transformation to the point of "*Ene1 Hak*".

2) Mahayana was based on social salvation; the Buddhas were deified and polytheism was in a sense re-worldised; in other words, the ideal of the Buddhas was prioritised; the buddhas postponed their own "*nirvana*" and remained on earth "*not to disappear*" for the salvation of all human beings. In Alevi-lik-Bektashism, the Four Doors and Forty Makams doctrine, after being carried to the point of Ene1 Hak, is perceived as a journey from Hakk to the people and overlaps with the "*Pole Doctrine*" in the context of the elevation of the perfect human being; it corresponds to the stage that emphasises the human being as the servant of establishing a perfect society.

In the history of philosophy, it is claimed that the tradition of seeking solutions to problems in the form of mutual "dialogue and discussion" began with the trio of Socrates-Platon-Aristotle. However, it is understood that this tradition had already begun in the East, in China and India.

Buddha used to explain his thoughts to those around him by travelling; he would talk to them and exchange ideas with them. Again in China, Confucius sought solutions to problems to discuss with his students.⁴⁷

47. "In Far Eastern thought, especially in Zen Buddhism, rational education based on the acquisition of knowledge and reasoning, communicated by words, is not valued. The aim is to experience the 'enlightenment', called satori in Zen, which the Buddha achieved. Since this enlightenment is an experience 'outside or beyond thought', any conceptualism or abstraction is avoided. Personal development is not the accumulation of words in the mind, but perhaps, on the contrary, the purification of accumulated words, in other words, of acquired wisdom... In a similar vein, Spinoza says that the way to the absolute happiness (...) that he wants people to attain does not come from appealing to their intellect. All human beings have the potential to 'awaken', but their minds are subject to various influences and these influences (...) block the way. The ability of a new knowledge to overcome these influences that have overtaken us, in other words, to change our already formed personality, will be realised not by being more convincing than these, but by creating in us an excitement even stronger than these influences.... According to Spinoza, perhaps one day all human beings will learn to learn rationally, but only a happy minority, a very select few, will have the privilege of looking at the world from the point of view of infinity (...). Spinoza says that in order for man to see himself at a level deeper than daily strife, at the level at which he processes the decisive infinite being within him, it is necessary to look with a faculty beyond reason, and call this kind of knowledge 'the third kind of knowledge' (...): 1) *The first kind of knowledge, or opinion or imagination, is the most primitive kind of knowledge...* 2) *The second kind of knowledge or *usavunna*,...* 3) *The third kind of knowledge or intuition (...).* This is the intuition of the existence and functioning of the essence of God in the essence of perceived things, after sufficient knowledge of the essence of God has been acquired.

Following in the footsteps of the Buddha, developing his teaching on the basis of the principles of reason and conducting it according to the rules of logic, Gotama (5th century B.C.; a thinker who took "*reasoning*" as the main principle in Indian thought and founded his theory of knowledge on this principle) developed a method based on "*reasoning*". He travelled in the great provinces of India: He explained his doctrine called Niyaya (*reasoning*) to his students gathered around him. According to Gotama's theory, in order for a thinking person to come up with an opinion, a thought, there had to be a "*unity and harmony*" between five elements. These elements are:

... As I have already said, according to Spinoza, all human beings, perhaps one day, will learn to know the second kind of knowledge, to act rationally, but only the most profound will be able to 'read' the world with the third kind of knowledge. Spinoza says that intuition is superior to reason in understanding the universe and life... For some, Spinoza is 'God-poisoned' (...) or 'God-drunk' (...), let alone God-atheist; ... Accordingly, if anything can be said about Spinoza, it is not that he is 'God-atheist' but that he is 'universe-atheist'... If by the concept of God we understand a being outside the universe who created the universe of his own free will and who rules over his creatures like a supreme king, punishing and rewarding them, we can immediately say that Spinoza is an atheist to this God. Spinoza's God is not creative, but productive. The difference is this: The creator creates with his own free will and judgement. According to Spinoza, the power of God is not a supreme will with infinite possibilities, but an irresistible power of production, and God is nothing but this irresistible power of production. God is the very life in all things... God produces under the necessity of his own nature. That is to say, it cannot fail to produce; 'just as the sum of the three angles of a triangle cannot fail to add up to 180 degrees', says Spinoza. The fact that God acts according to the necessity of his nature does not mean that God is not free. God is free in the sense that no force can force him to act otherwise from outside (...). But God's freedom is not arbitrary either. God acts in accordance with the necessity of his own laws. God's laws are the same as the laws of nature, and even God cannot change the course of nature. The universe is a continuous formation; God is self-generating, reproducing. ." Fransez, Mo- ris; Spinoza'nın Tao'su/Akıllı İnançtan İnançlı Akla; Yol Yayıncılık Tic. Ltd. Şti.; İstanbul- 2004; pp, 127-135

- 1) Proposition
- 2) Cause
- 3) Lighting
- 4) Application and
- 5) It was the result.

Since all of these elements required each other, the "*omission*" of one of them would indicate the inconsistency and invalidity of the thought. According to Gotama, man was a "*thinking*" being; however, it was the "*soul*" that enabled the act of thinking and the "*mind*" that governed it. The soul and the body were separate entities. When the sovereignty of the soul over the body ended, the event called "*e1'um*" would begin. Since the sense organs were connected to the body, the impressions provided by them had to be "controlled" by the mind.

This method, which was practised in Indian thought until the end of the XIXth century, was called "*Niyaya*". Niyaya is not only a method of reasoning, but also a method of "*discussion and dialogue*" used to find solutions to problems. Niyaya has elements of the dialectical method, but it is not a pure dialectic: *It is a "dialectic of opposing arguments" in arriving at a definite conclusion.*

Gotama's teaching is the essence of the Indian epoch of "*rational thought*". For this reason, Gotama can be regarded as the founder of Indian rationalism and the concept of Niyaya as the "*basic principle*" of this movement.

In Anatolian Sufism, another name for God is "Truth": This concept existed in some Indian religions, for example in Sikh religion, in the periods preceding the understanding in Anatolia, and the name of God in god-scientific philosophy was "GerçeV".

Platonism does not regard objects as real, but rather their "*first instances of divinity*"; this understanding also became the basis of the medieval "*realism*" movement. In medieval realism, "general concepts" were accepted as real.

In Anatolian Sufism, which feeds on both designs, this

In time, this understanding gave rise to the belief in calling God "*Truth*", which was perceived as the most general concept or the richest abstraction.

All the data captured in Indian designs were also present in Chinese designs: Cynicism, the first Chinese religion, was a kind of 'living-ci/W'. The universe was constructed not by a divine power, but by an "iJû *man*"; the contradiction-conflict between the male principle "Rng" and the female principle "ön" was the "force" of change and transformation. In a way, Kofucianism was formed by the "*covenanting*" of Cynicism.

In Taoism, the mystical Chinese religion (f o u n d e d in the VI century B C), opposing principles such as male-female, positive-negative, true-false, etc. w e r e realised in Tao. In other words, *it was "overcoming"* its opposition and contradiction by attaining reality in Tao.

Taoism, which preceded Confucianism and was structured in an understanding that was opposed to it, was based on Confucianism's view of social happiness.

"individual happiness".

When asked, "*What is your prayer?*", Confucius replied;

"-*My prayer is my life*", Confucius, like his contemporary Socrates, wanted to teach people the ways of a good and happy life. And he said;

"- *Man should know that he knows what he knows; he should know that he does not know what he does not know*".

Confucius, who rejected metaphysics as unknowable, was an ancient phenomenologist. For this reason, his trinity was also a trilemma: "*Mother-Father-Son*".

(Religion of equality, brotherhood and prosperity)

SHAMANISM

"The soul is the organism that transforms biological matter
is the breath of
life... As Spinoza said,
the soul is what the body can do. ⁴⁸

Shamanism, the Asian source of Anatolian Alevism, is a belief system of Central Asian "*kinsman*" human societies. It corresponds to the "*matrilineal*" order in the lower barbarism. It is a "*totem-less, upright*" belief system that came to the fore as a symbol of the sanctity of blood with the introduction of the first sexual prohibitions. Since maternal law is dominant, almost all totems and guardian spirits are "*female*". It is a religion of equality, brotherhood and happiness.

In Shamanism, a person who is believed to have the ability to establish a relationship with spirits, the other world and to give shi- fa, and who organises rites and ceremonies is called "Shaman" or "*Kam*". Shaman or Kam is an "*extraordinary*" person in physical and spiritual terms. He fulfils his duties in a state of *ecstasy*. In this state, he reaches the world of spirits; sometimes on-

48. Berardi, Franco "Bifo"; jun *İşbaşındaYabancılaşmadan Oto- nomiye* (Trans. Fırat Genç); Metis; İstanbul- 2012; p, 19

becomes the *"spokesperson"* of the spirits. He acquires his supernatural abilities either *"from the left"* or as a result of a *"selection"* by the spirits. Whichever the case, in order for the shaman to be accepted by the society, he must receive training from his teachers and pass the difficult *"examination"*, which is a tradition.

All the invocations and dances of the shaman were *"improvised"*, and in a state of ecstasy he wore a drum, a drum mallet, a headdress, a robe, jewellery with a metal sound and special clothes.

Shamans could be male or female. The 'anaerufic' character of the first stages of organisation was reflected in the identity of the Times and this situation lasted for a long period. Shamans were either women or men who *"behaved like women"* and were appointed by the matriarchy.

In essence, shamanism is a religion of symbols, a religion of icons and symbols, formed by the *"embodiment"* of certain parts of the objective universe, such as the Sky, the Earth, the Underworld, in which communities live, in order to represent the conscience of the community. It is an extraordinarily practical *"way of the universe"* that interprets and applies the supra-personal forces of nature to the thoughts and behaviours of the so-called *"human beings"* in society.

Today, we are trying to recognise the societies living in the *"lower barbarian"* state of humanity only by means of a *"pie-pie"* by looking at their geographical locations and types in the twilight of prehistoric legends. According to the History of Herodotus, which is perceived as the first scientific *"monument-writing"*, there was no group called *"Turk"* among the Central Asian societies in the VI.-V. century BC. However, it mentions *"two clusters of people"* who appear to be Central Asians:

- 1) The Meskhetian people live in the region of today's Turkestan and in a state of *"low barbarism"*; they are dominated by *"anafianism"* because they are *"potters"*; they have a heroic mother-khan named Tomris at their head.

2) The Scythians live in the "**middle barbarian**" state of humanity in the areas extending from the Danube to the **Altai** Mountains and from there to the border of China; since they were able to reach the "fObanJı£" level of production, they are dominated by the "*babahans*".

Again, we learn from the History of Herodotus that there were mobile, warlike communities living in Central Asia. These communities, which attacked and returned to the Middle Eastern civilisations, entered the history under three names:

- 1) Sumerians; destroyed the Medes society;
- 2) Scythians drove the Cimmers society on the Medes;
- 3) The Meskhetes pushed the Scythians onto the Bimmers and, by extension, onto the civilisations of Iraq-Egypt.

These upheavals were in fact a "*migration*" of "*barbarian*" communities between the Far-Eastern and Near-Eastern civilisations. This kind of great migrations, as recorded in the written history, took place "twice":

- a) The first barbarian social flows took place before the birth of Jesus, between the Far Eastern Chinese civilisation and the Near Eastern civilisations of Iraq and Egypt;
- b) The second barbarian social flows took place after the birth of Christ, between the Chinese-Indian civilisations of the Far East and the Greek-Roman civilisations of the Mediterranean.

During these great migrations, which took place 3-5 centuries before and after Christ, history has not recorded the name of the Turk or the Turkic community as "*kaya L'*". There is no "*common denominator*" on the origin of the word "Turk"; there is only a certain weighting that it comes from the word "töre".

The first Turkish state bearing the name Turk was the Göktürk-Kök Türk-

(532-744) state. In the Göktürk inscriptions, the word was written as "türk" or "türük". Based on the spelling (tu-küe) in Chinese sources, it was suggested that the word was originally "tö- rük", took the form of "fiiruf" in the period preceding the VIIth century, and then became widespread as "nirt".

It is concluded that the name "Type" was given to a group of people living in Central Asia "later".

The "entry" of a community into history occurs when *that* community is commemorated in "written history": This becomes a "reality" when a pre-civilised classless society comes into contact with a civilised "classed" society. In this context, the Turks' coming into contact with the civilisations of the Far East and the Near East *led to their being "remembered in history under the Turkish name"*.

Shamanism entered a process of "evolution" in parallel with social development. The relations with the surrounding civilisations accelerated this process. The society jumped from the "lower barbaric level" to the "middle barbaric level"; this was followed by the "transformation" of Shamanism. The blood organisation based on maternal law, which was the basis of shamanism, was bound to be "changed" for the benefit of men. The result was the emergence of "ildini", a "religion of reconciliation with equal rights" between the law of women and the law of men.

Although in China and Iraq the agricultural economy had been introduced and settled life had begun, in Central Asia the economy of the "cho- banli" was still dominant. Then iron, the "telcnic element" of high barbarism, entered the Turkish society; the technique originating from iron was "taken over" by men. In parallel to this, the "primitive communal" social order, which had been established until then and whose peaceful side was predominant, acquired a "warlike" character. But *there was not yet a "state"*, because the state emerged where the blood organisation *was the "way"*. Neither the "il" organisation nor the "ilhanllk" organisation was a state; it was a "blood" organisation. The defeated "if" was either destroyed or incorporated into the "i/".

and the defeated blood with its god. *The "blood"*, which, together with its god, joined the eaten and defeated blood, formed a "*federation*" with it. In Shamanism, everywhere was *the "middle world"*; under the Earth and above the Earth.

tü was not "*discovered*"; in the objective universe in which they lived and of which they were a part, everything had "souls"; in this primitive "*living being*" environment, "*communication*" between "souls" was established by the Times. With the Il-religion, the Middle World turned into *the "Lower Lake"*; it became a living **space** where good and evil, right and wrong travelled arm in arm. **For the victors, the "Lower Sky" and for the victors, the "Middle World" was "conquered"**.

When the social development evolved from "*middle barbarian*" to "*upper barbarian*", motherhood was defeated and fatherhood established "absolute" dominance.

The conscience of the society was now "*male*", and religion, which was perceived as the reflection of this conscience in the heavens, had to undergo a similar change. As a result, a "*religion of proclamation*" based on male domination emerged.

The values of Shamanism were not the values created by civilised people in a civilised land, but were the values of a pre-civilised "*communal society*". These "*primitive communal*" values were "*carried*" to Anatolian soil by people migrating to the west in masses and became a productive source for the formation of the Bâtınî Philosophy in Asia Minor.

These Shamanist values in Anatolian soil:

- 1) They inspired a spiritual utopia for the salvation of humanity;
- 2) It became a shelf with the determinant productive forces in the field of actual production; it challenged the system that drives civilisation;
- 3) In the context of human productive power, Alevism-Bektashism made **the greatest** contribution to the structuring and shaping of Alevism-Bektashism;
- 4) It was the source of humanitarianism taking sides with the people and equality between men and women.

idealism-materialism (idealism-materialism is a universe Gbragtt)
PHILOSOPHY OF LIGHT OR EMANATION

"... God is the one who exists before his own laws,
apart from his laws,
outside of them. God is the same thing as
his laws. ⁴⁹

Since Islamic thought, which originated from the Qur'an, placed a heavy emphasis on "*faith*", philosophy, which was based on *the "principles of the sciences"*, came under "*siege*". In the hands of Farabi, Ibn Sina, Ibn Rushd and their followers, philosophy, which initially adhered only to an Aristotelian view, took on the character of a doctrine that tried to "*reconcile*" faith and reason; the importance of reason was "*emphasised*" while the influence of faith was "*confirmed*".

Later, the "*inspiration*" from Plato and Neo-Platonism intensified. In the hands of Ghazali, Muhyiddin Arabi and their followers, who chose the path of Sufism in this channel, philosophy took on the character of a doctrine that placed the intellect *under the "control"* of faith arising from a deep divine love. According to this doctrine, it was out of the question for the intellect to achieve success if it did not originate from the light of "*love and faith*".

49. Fransez, Moris; *Sf'inoza'stu Tao'bu/ALI1h İnançtın İnanç Ak- la*, Yol Yayıncılık Tic. Ltd. Şti.; İstanbul- 2004; pp, 143-151

In the meantime, Democritus' atomistic understanding began to "blossom"; it was also nourished by ancient Iranian and Indian thought. This doctrine, which was based on pure philosophy and was connected to the principles of reason, was structured in the form of the "Mutazilite" movement. In the hands of Vasil b. Ata and his followers, this doctrine popularised a "materialist" perspective. It enabled the formation of currents of thought "independent" of religion, which would put "name" against belief.

(Aristotelesçi) Uzlaşmacılar

"There are three beings worthy of
respect: the priest, the
warrior and the bard.
To know, to kill and to create. Other
people are a bunch of drudges,
they were made for the stables,
to practise what is called a profession.⁵⁰

Farabi (870- 950), who tried to "reconcile" Aristotle's philosophy with Islamic thought by putting it into practice with a new interpretation, focused more on "metaphysical" problems. He argued that the seemingly irreconcilable issues between philosophy and Islam were not in essence but in "form". Not only that; from Aristoteles' concepts of ("fuf")and "action", Based on Platon's *theory of the "idea"*, we can also analyse these two sages

He tried to "reconcile".

According to Farabi, philosophy was the knowledge of "vaioJa"; by gaining this knowledge, man had the opportunity to "approach" God. The way to arrive at the "first cause" of existence was to return to one's essence, to try to understand the "principle" that established one's own existence. In order to arrive at the truth, one has to overcome the pressure of the senses.

50. Baudelaire Charles; *Kötiilik Çiçekfeni* (Trans.: Sait Maden); Çekirdek Publications; Second edition; Istanbul 1998; p,15

and had to continue his endeavour to reach God *"through love"*. Love, which is a "light" illuminating the human mind, was not only an emotion but also the basis of the act of *"knowing"*. The nervous power of man, composed of spirit and matter, could only be overcome by *"love"*. Knowledge was *"innate"*, it could not be acquired through the work of the thinking power; where it came from and how it was formed cannot be known. Innate knowledge was the first knowledge; apart from this knowledge, there was also knowledge acquired *"through thinking, through reasoning"*. Another faculty in the acquisition of knowledge was *"intuition"*. Intuition was also of two types; one was based on "senses and reason" and the other on *"thinking"*. Intuition based on senses and reason was used to *"perceive"* the external universe, while intuition based on thinking was used to *"grasp"* the principles of objects.

Farabi denies the concepts of *"atom"* and *"void"* originating from naturalist thinkers; he adopts Aristotle's theory of *"matter"* and *"form"*. According to him, matter, in spite of all its qualitative changes, was formed as a *"summi"*; *"determination"* was dominant in nature. Matter was *"one with matter"*. The essence of the universe was earth, fire, wind and water. The *"qualities"* found in these four constituent elements were in the structure of all types of beings in the universe.

Although each body carried the possibility of movement within itself, the material universe received its *"necessity"* from God.

Again, Farabi divided beings into two:

- 1) The beings whose existence is necessary by itself; for the existence of the necessary being, no other cause was needed; it was in a state of action from the beginning; no evidence could be shown for it; it was competent and beautiful; it was the proof and supreme cause of every object.

- 2) Beings whose existence is not necessary by itself;
A cause was necessary for its existence.

In Farabi, the soul's ability to act *is called "understanding and perception"*.

"to be a part of the neighbourhood". These tasks were of three types:

- a) Vegetative spirit; protection of the person, growth and maintenance of the lineage;
- b) Animal spirit; taking what is useful and discarding what is harmful;
- c) The human soul: walking in the light of reason to find what is good, beautiful and useful. **The intellect** existed in the child's soul as a subtle power; when it perceived the forms of objects, it went into a state of action.

There were four stages of intellect:

- a) Intellect in the state of latent power; intellect that has the ability to become forms; forms are not separated from their essence.
- b) The intellect in the state of action; the revelation of the abilities in the intellect in the state of latent power; forms are separated from its essence.
- c) Acquired intellect; the intellect capable of understanding those who depend on the order of the universe;
- d) Active intellect; the intellect that is a bridge between man and God.

There were six principles of being, ranked progressively from the highest to the lowest:

- 1) the first principle of cause, divine being;
- 2) The principle of the second cause, the intelligences that make up the celestial spheres;
- 3) The principle of the active intellect; the enabling of creative action;
- 4) The principle of soul; the principle of becoming that moulds the essence of the species of being;
- 5) The principle of form; the principle that constitutes the final form of the object, its quality in the field of appearance;

6) The principle of immaterial matter; the principle that enables the object to be a body.

Concrete objects were found in six stages:

- 1) Celestial beings;
- 2) Human beings;
- 3) Animal;
- 4) Plant
- 5) Mineral and
- 6) Four constituent elements (water, food, earth, fire).

The Islamic philosopher Ibn Sina (980-1037), who interpreted Aristotelian philosophy according to Islamic thought and contributed to the development of an "empiricist" method, continued the line of Farabi. According to him, the true source of knowledge was "*intuition*", but "*experiment*" also had an effect on the formation of knowledge. The certainty and accuracy of knowledge depended on its conformity to the "*rules of reason*". The rules of reason, on the other hand, were "*innate*", immutable and generally valid principles in the human understanding; conformity to these rules was also valid for knowledge "*acquired later*" and gained through the senses. Existence was related to "conceiving"; all that was conceived was a being. and existents were conceivable conceivable forms; therefore, thinking and being were "*identical*".

According to Ibn Sina, universals existed in the thought of God as a "*divine concept*" before the formation of all kinds of beings; in this context, "*universals*" were the cause of the formation of beings.

The subject of physics was objects composed of matter and form; form was created "before" matter, and it was form that gave matter the quality of "*substance*". Natural objects were known by their essence and qualities. Qualities were divided into two:

- a) Qualities that existed in relation to objects;
- b) Qualities that exist apart from objects; they constitute the basis of the power and movement in the objective universe.

Objects act **with the "latent power"** inherent in them. This latent power was divided into three:

- 1) Natural force: it carries the qualities related to natural forms;
- 2) Subjective power: it carries the qualities that move the object or bring it to a stationary state;
- 3) Spiritual power; it carries the quality of acting directly with a will, without the help of any organ or instrument.

Again, according to Ibn Sina, the soul was divided into two:

- 1) Plant spirit and
- 2) The human soul does not need a body; it knows itself directly; therefore it is a spiritual substance. This substance, which moves the body and gives it vitality, is also the ability to think competently, the instantaneous.

Vitality was a "*combination*", it consisted of the combination of natural organs with the help of celestial forces. This took place in accordance with certain stages:

- 1) The first stage, the plant stage, reproduction by seed, nourishment and growth:
- 2) the second stage, the animal stage, self-movement and perception.

The intellect was of five types:

- a) Material intellect; the ability to comprehend and know; common to all human beings;
- b) The active intellect, the faculty that enables the simple to be known; it is directed towards action;
- e) Active intellect; the ability that enables the comprehension of acquired data;
- d) Acquired intellect; the ability that enables the knowledge of objects that are given to oneself and that can be thought;
- e) The divine intellect; the ability to comprehend the essence and source of all kinds of existence, the power that constitutes them.

God was the source of things, creatures, the whole of existence; God "*appeared*" in objects, events and actions. Existence was not "*existent*" and "*jroJ*"; it was divided into three parts:

- 1) Possible existence; existence dominated by change, becoming and decay in relation to objects;
- 2) Spontaneously contingent existence; the universe of existence in which universals and laws exist;
- 3) Necessary being by itself; the first cause or the being of God; unchanging and non-proliferating.

Islamic thought by reinterpreting Aristotle's philosophy

§The Andalusian Arab philosopher Ibn Rūsd (1126-1198), who tried to reconcile the thought of religion with philosophy, wanted to prove that the problems of religion could be brought to "*new compositions*" in the light of philosophy.

According to him, the main problem of philosophy was to ascertain "*universal* existence"; therefore, philosophy should be based on universals and try to understand the universe. Universal existence is defined as that which is perceived by the senses.

It was possible to "*withdraw*" from the being that was recognised and explained according to the principles of reason. To deny the "*body-effect*" relationship established between the created and to "*bind*" every object to the will of God, to "*affirm*" that existence has its own laws, to "*affirm/a-*

"not". However, the laws of nature *were* "**independent**" of God's will by the power of their being.

According to him, philosophers used three different ways of thinking;

- a) Discourse
- b) Dialectic and
- c) Proof.

What was important for philosophy was the method of "proving". The unchanging, eternal and indefinite "what-what" was necessary; it was the "perfect" example of reality. Opposites were in the universe of "*becoming*" and "*annihilation*"; God was the "ttimfi" of these opposites.

Materialists (except for the belief in the Alamam)

"But what Dionysus really represents is nature, *nature* in all its aspects, and the force that brings *man to the back of nature*.⁵¹

In the Bâtînî view of the universe, science constitutes the "*foundation*" of faith. Because, "*without consciousness if 2° of 8everless; science without faith is worthless*".

Science begins with the believer's "*knowing*" God and "*understanding*" His place. It is impossible for a person who "does not know himself" to know God. As a person acquires science, he finds the opportunity to "*contemplate*" the characteristics and qualities of the divine being: The science for knowing the existence of God is not achieved by experimentation or observation, but by "*turning inward, diving into deep contemplation, and realising that there is no existence other than God in the heart*".

In this context, what is meant by the term science is "the heart".

51. Şengör A.M. Celal; Nietzsche and 'Akla' *İsyân*; Cogito; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Yapı Kredi Publications; İstanbul- 2001; Issue: 25; s, 240

"ir/an", which is called "*knowledge*". Neo-Platonist views originating from Plotinus dominate the interpretation of this knowledge. With the widespread spread of Bâtînî Philosophy-thought and belief, science has gained the meaning of "understanding" the unity consisting of the trinity of "*God-human-eva*".

In this context, science is a "light" that enables a person to be sublimated, to comprehend the *d i v i n e* qualities he carries, to mature, to know the "*human-God*" identification by experiencing it in his own being. Yunus explains the science understanding of the Bâtînî Philosophy in a striking way:

"Knowledge is to know
knowledge, knowledge is to
know oneself, knowledge is
to know oneself, you don't
know yourself, how many
readings is that?"

During the formation period of Islamic thought, two paths emerged, one based on the "principles of reason" and the other based on the "*data of faith*": The path based on the principles of reason chose "philosophy", while the path based on the data of faith chose "*religion* and theology".

The first doctrine that asserted that thought, knowledge and science were a matter of "reason and *consciousness*", that they originated from "*nature*" and that *there was "no place" for prejudices and views incompatible with reason in this field* was called "*Mutazila*". The pioneer of this epoch, which means "*Amilan*," "*holding another way*," was Wasil b. Ata (699-749). According to him, the "*identity*" of essence (*zat*) and quality (*sılat*) in God, which was asserted on the basis of the Qur'an and Hadith, is not true; both essence and quality are "*separate*" entities: To say that they reach unity in the divine essence leads to the interpretation of "*one*" as two separate objects, which is a "*contradiction*".

Destiny is "*unreal*"; man is a *being* of will; he is independent in all his actions; there is no "*controlling*" power outside the will. Destiny is the "*freedom*" of the human will.

It removes the obligation of man to do *what is "foretold"*, which is incompatible with the glory of God.

As an individual, man is *"responsible"* for his actions, since he acts according to his free will: There can be no question of "guilt" or "reward" for an act that is not in his hands, but is fulfilled by fate. Since it is impossible for God and man to converse, even indirectly, *the "divine declaration" is nothing more than "his hand"*. Prophets are also human beings; in them *"nature'ust'ü, insa-*

The belief in the existence of "supernatural" faculties is a fallacy.

Since man is a "being of *reason*", his judgements and propositions must be in accordance with reason. Knowledge has two sources, one is *"sense data"* and the other is *"reasoning"*: Impressions provided by the senses are "moulded" according to the principles of reason and transformed into knowledge, gaining the quality of "concept".

The Mutazilite doctrine is based on the problems of "man and knowledge". According to this doctrine, there was no question of the *"reality"* of an object that was incompatible with the principles of reason and not given to man through the senses. The universe was finite and limited because it was a whole composed of *"atoms"*, which were indivisible entities; it was not created out of nothing, but out of a *"combination of creative elements"*.

Although some Mutazilite philosophers argued that atoms were *"fiardtlll with the expression of God"*, this should be considered as an *"iid'ün"* given to Sunni Sharia.

The perpetrators of the Mutazilite doctrine of al-Wasil b. Ata were Ib-rahim Nazzam and Abu'l-Huzeyl al-Allaf.

The Arab philosopher Nazzam (?-845), who pioneered the establishment of a philosophy based on the principles of reason; although he adhered to the Mutazilite doctrine, he also put forward ideas that were considered original: Nazzam's understanding of the universe is based on Heraclitus, Democritus and Anaxagoras. According to him, nature was an "organic" whole; what was latent in this whole was *"hidden"*, *"hidden1g- UTHmundan*

state". Change and time, this latent

It was the process of *"dQllma"*.

In reality, objects existed as a whole in the beginning; all events that had happened and would happen were in this "*hidden universality*". The universe was a whole composed of essences called "*atoms*". God had also created these atoms, but the creation was not continuous but "*once and for all*".

In the "fsîamJıkta WJ-skin akwunm" had five principles:

- 1) Man creates his own actions; he is free and does not depend on fate (***denial of the belief in accident and fate, which is one of the main conditions of Islam***);
- 2) God has no attributes distinct from Himself (*Islam's denial of the understanding of monotheism*),
- 3) There is a rank of offender between the believer and the unbeliever;
- 4) It is obligatory for God to punish the evil and to reward the good; forgiveness can be granted only in the sphere of worship concerning God's rights; otherwise, it is contrary to God's justice for the servants to be forgiven by God for their self-created actions; it is inconceivable that God should forgive those who do what God has forbidden;
- 5) Doing good things and not doing bad things.

The basic views of Anatolian Bâtûnîs' understanding of materialism are summarised in the concepts of "*time*", "*time*", "*creation*", "*God*", "*matter*" and "*spirit*". There is no creative, creative and developing power "*outside*" time and matter. Time is connected with "*matter*" in terms of its existence. There is neither time "*without matter*" nor "*matter*" without time. As religions and some philosophical doctrines assert, there is no "*independent spirit*" outside matter. Furthermore, it is "*wrong*" to think of a spiritual object that is eternal and exists only by itself. All objects gathered under the concept of existence are matter; "*there is no God without matter*". In reality, the universe-

God is one and the same with the *rhin*, and its essence is "*matter*". The event of "*creation*", which is said to have been realised by the free will of God, is also "*unreal*".

Events such as resurrection after death, judgement, first offence, reward, punishment, etc., which are asserted by monotheistic religions, are also "*null and void*". In the material universe, there is no event or occurrence *that does not "find" its source in matter*.

Knowledge is a perception provided by the senses; it has no source "*outside nature*". Universals are the products of "*abstraction*" made from sense data, they are "*not real*". The only ruling faculty of man is reason, which is the "*natural*" result of a development based on matter. These views were most clearly defended by thinkers such as the Iranian philosopher Ravendi (?-910), who argued that truths could only be grasped by reason, and the Khorasan poet Bashshar b. Burd (?-873), who adopted Mutazilite thought and defended rationalism.

Ravendi, the founder of the epoch known as Dehriyyun (*materialism*), considered only matter as "*real*"; approached philosophical problems with a method based on "*materialist and instrumental principles*"; and concentrated on the universe, God, man, knowledge, creation, reason, death, soul, etc.

According to him, the source of belief was "*reason*", and even thoughts that were "*contrary*" to reason were the product of reason. Man, as a natural being, was not created; therefore, he did not have a "*supernatural*" quality. The beings considered supernatural were formed from "*sense and senses*". There was no supernaturalism in the universe, which was "*identical*" with man in terms of structure.

Reason was a "*natural*" faculty that was formed and shaped in man over time; reason was the measure of all truth and righteousness. For example, "*the works of the pey'gambes1er were not compatible with reason, so we were fooled*".

There was no "*knowable*" existence outside of the events experienced; knowledge was formed by "*shaping*" the impressions provided by the senses according to the principles of reason. In this context, the knowledge of religions

The data they put forward were not real, since they were not acquired through the "senses", but were "empty conjecture".

God was an "abstract" concept; it was a product of the "divine thought". There was no divine object, no divine power in the universe. As God "did not exist", there was no favour or forgiveness attributed to Him; assertions such as Heaven, Hell, resurrection after death, foreknowledge of the future were also "unreal". Death, in the sense of the "dissolution" of the essences constituting the body, was a natural event; the design of immortality was "absurd". Every object could change, disintegrate, reunite and integrate. Only the whole called "universe" was immortal.

The soul, on the other hand, was the natural "life force" of the body; it was not a "dependent" entity, not a substance. Therefore, the views put forward by religions were "wrong". Since there was no independent spirit being, there was no "spiritual universe" or "universe of spirits". Neither "being" came out of non-existence, nor "poIfic" out of being. The creation event was a product of the "dream of belief".

Ravendi's views, which were met with a great reaction in the Sunni Islamic world, favoured the development of "subtle" materialism". Against the philosophy of Plato-Aristotle-Plotinus, he planted the "atomist" understanding of Democritus, the leading name of "primeval materialism".

According to Bashshar b. Burd, the best way was the way of 'reason'. The fact that man was created from clay was a "lie". All our knowledge consisted of the events we experienced and the impressions we gained from the environment. Man was the "most superior" being among natural beings because of his "aJrzf". The source of our thoughts was "our senses". The universe in which we lived was real; therefore, there was no "meaning" in adopting a realm of existence that existed only in thought, and in longing to attain it.

(Akh Verealer to the Control of Intuition)
Intuitive Platonists

"As Marx wrote, from the
Stone Age to the star wars,
If there is to be a universal story for human beings, it will not be a story
of success, but of poverty and suffering."⁵²

The view that certain and generally valid knowledge could not be reached by relying on the principles of experiment and reason gained a "new character" with the influence of a belief originating from monotheistic religions. According to this doctrine, reason was "limited and incomplete". Being a being of reason, man, by nature, "had no possibility" to comprehend divine and universal truths. Because, although man was "limited", God and the divine universe were "unlimited". There could be no fear of the limited "knowing" the unlimited.

However, man was a being who wanted to "know". In order to fulfil this need, a guiding, enlightening "light" was necessary. According to the theologians, this light could only be "divine grace". And divine grace would illuminate not the intellect but *the intellect*. This illumination was in the form of an "in-birth" and constituted the "intuition" that realised knowing.

The heart, enlightened by divine grace, surpassed the limits of the intellect, and "spontaneously grasped the vision" of "to be known". This view, which enabled the unknowable to be known, was called "mysticism" in Anatolia and "theology" in Christianity. The Iranian mystic Beya-zid Bistami (?-874), influenced by Neo-Platonism, based on the belief in the "unity of existence", He argued that "man has a divine quality".

He was born into a family recognised as Mazdek or Zoroastrian.

52. Zeytinoğlu Emre; *Theodoz Adomo'nun Sanat Tanımı ve Protes- to*; Cogito; Yapı Kredi Yayınları; Quarterly Journal of Thought; Issue: 36; Summer 2003; p. 250

According to Bistami, man and God were "identical", God was visible in man. All types of being were "one"; the difference was only in "appearance".

Existence was "*being*" in God, and being in God was "coming into being". Appearance was a "*form*", and the invisible and real essence was the "imaginary object". The purpose of acquiring knowledge was to "*comprehend*" God, who appeared in man "in the field of vision". The supreme being in man as the divine essence was the "soul"; the soul was immortal, and when it left the body, it "*reunited*" with its supreme source, God.

To know was to recognise oneself, to recognise God in oneself; seeking God was to seek "*oneself*", seeking oneself was to seek "*God*".

This is what Bistami meant by the maxim "*God is in me*". According to him, the search for God would be "*with love*": He who loved himself loved "*God*", and he who loved God loved "*himself*". He who worshipped himself worshipped "*God*"; he who worshipped God worshipped "*himself*".

The Iranian philosopher Abu Bakr Zakariya Razi (841-926), the founder of Naturalism in Islam, concentrated on the "*source*" of knowledge. According to him, the first condition for understanding man was to analyse him in life as an "*imagined being*"; this could be achieved through "*experimentation and observation*" because the source of knowledge was the "*senses*" and the senses were the foci where impressions about the external universe, which was the subject of experimentation and observation, "*occurred*". The external universe was material and real; the soul and God were "*external to this universe*". Five principles constituted the totality of being:

- 1) God;
- 2) Space (absolute space);
- 3) Duration (absolute time)
- 4) Spirit (light, brightness); and
- 5) Matter (darkness).

Human reason was sufficient both to "*grasp*" these spheres of existence and to "*d'ûzen1*" life. For this reason, it was "unnecessary" to believe in or expect the existence of someone endowed with supernatural powers; this also included prophets; their thoughts were not "*sufficient* and real" because they were incompatible with reason.

According to him, the universe was created by God's "free" will; the basic principle of this creation was "*divine knowledge*". The beginning of all beings that appeared in creation was absolute light (*nun*); matter, individual essence and natural light came into being from it; the only spiritual entities such as "*cev- heh*" were born from it.

On the other hand, the source of qualities such as wetness-dryness, heat-coldness was "*objective existence*", these qualities were a kind of "*shadow existence*"; the heavens and the earth were formed from these "*four qualities*"; therefore, the heavens and the earth were "*identical*".

Razi argued that the first matter, which was the basic element in the formation of the universe, was formed from "*scattered atoms*". These atoms, which were "*prone*" to change, merged with small parts of the void in different proportions and formed the first "*founding principles*" of nature: These principles are;

- 1) Air; because it is loose, it moves upwards;
- 2) Water, being dense, moves towards the centre of the earth;
- 3) Earth, because it is dense, moves towards the centre of the earth;
- 4) Fire moves upwards because it is loose;
- 5) Celestial element; it provides a balanced distribution of matter and void; its movement is in the form of a circle.

Hallac-i Mansur (857-922) put forward the view that man and God are identical.

Hallac-i Mansur, who was executed by whipping, dismemberment, hanging, beheading and burning, explained the *"God-universe-human trinity"* in the context of the Unity of Existence-Unity of Existence. According to him, what was real, what existed was "One"; multiplicity was an "appearance"; it was the *"reflection"* of "One" in different forms and qualities. The *"One"* was God; however, the universe and man were not outside this "One", they were within it; they were identical with it. For this reason, it was *"natural and necessary"* for man to say *"fheJ Hak"*. Man was a God who spoke, travelled, thought, rejoiced, laughed, grieved, and became angry. All the qualities of God were in man and all the qualities of man were in God in a *"firJic and unity"*. Death was not real, it was a *"change"*, an "appearance"; therefore one's death was *"in life" and one's life was "in death"*. The universe was not created; it was formed as a result of the *"reflection"* of the essence of God, a source of light. Since there was no being other than God, it was not correct to speak of a *"created object"*.

The Arab philosopher Abubarakāt Baghdadi (1076-1166) defended the view that existence is *"not"* connected with perception. He criticised Aristotle's views; in particular, he argued that Aristotle's views on *"hamket and power"* were *"incompatible"* with the realities seen in the universe and contained explanations based only on "concepts". He also opposed Aristotle's classification of sciences and his views on *"metaphysics and epistemology"*.

According to Baghdadi, the subject of science was "existence". Sciences were divided into three in terms of content:

- 1) The sciences of the senses deal with the information obtained through the senses from the entities surrounding the human environment, the sources and objects of that information; they are natural sciences.
- 2) The sciences of the moment; dependent on the human being's own thinking environment, not his environment; directly related to external events

It covers beings that are processed, organised and explained by the productive power of the intellect.

3) The sciences of the mind; theology and metaphysics; the science of incorporeal beings that have nothing to do with the senses and the sensible universe.

According to Baghdadi, who approached the problem of existence with the phenomenon of "perception", the existence of an existing object was not "indebted" to perception or the perceiver. Perception was not the condition of existence; on the contrary, existence was the absolute condition of perception. An existing object existed by itself; it existed or could exist "before" perception as well as "after" perception.

In the act of knowing, one's "*knowing*" that one knows is the main-thing; it was an event of consciousness. Making judgements with the knowledge of the unknown, "*not knowing*" what one knows.

The source of knowledge was usually "*senses*", but there was also knowledge that had "separate" qualities that the mind "*processed*" and developed from sensory data. In this context, Baghdadi divides knowledge into two in terms of its "*quality*":

a) Plain and incomplete knowledge; knowledge that is provided directly by the senses; knowledge that does not pass through the filter of the intellect.

b) Compound and complete knowledge; knowledge that has passed the control of the intellect, filtered and organised.

Baghdadi defended a "*contrary*" view to Islamic thought on death: According to him, there was no "*resurrection*" after death; there was no question of "*regaining life*".

In this context, Abubarakāt Baghdadi argued that the "*senses*" were also "*dre- sin*" and "*favourable*" to the truth. According to him, despite their dependence on the mortal body, the senses were the foci of "*more precise knowledge*" in understanding the world, because the senses could "*control*" each other and one sense could correct the "*mistakes*" of the other. But there was no such '*olaraf*' for the soul.

Baghdadi's ideas spread rapidly; knowledge was divided into spiritual and

Against the philosophical currents that regarded faith as a divine being, he created an *"age of criticism based on experimentation"*. According to this epoch, as long as faith (belief) kept reason under its *"sovereignty"*, there was no *"possibility"* of attaining certain knowledge; reason had *"infallible"* measures and *"unchanging"* principles; the data provided by the senses gained *"certainty"* by passing through the control of reason. A person who thought according to the principles of reason could find the truth by *"comparing"* sense data with each other. The *"innate knowledge"*, which was claimed to exist in the soul, was *not sufficient* to *"understand"* the world in which one lived; *this knowledge could only "teach"* the divine being.

The Arab philosopher Avfi (10th century), one of the five founders of the philosophical epoch called *"Örvanu s-Sağa"*, which originated from Neo-Platonism, expressed his thoughts within the integrity of a philosophy of life. The main subject emphasised by the community he was a part of was *"education"*. According to them, education was divided into four stages:

- a) Education between the ages of 12-30; finding oneself, getting used to regular life; listening to the teacher's words, acting according to his/her warnings and advice; trying to understand one's ego, mastering one's emotions and passions.
- b) Education between the ages of 30-40; philosophical knowledge acquisition; getting to know the environment.
- c) Education between the ages of 40-50; acquiring knowledge of divine matters; endeavouring to comprehend divine mysteries. The mature person who reaches this stage becomes equal to the prophets and achieves a success that can be considered superhuman.
- d) After the age of 50, education; joining among the people who are closest to God; dissolution from the bonds of the world; rising above all the rules proposed by religions.

According to the view of the Ikhwan al-Safa community, the universe came into being from God through *"g u s h i n g "*. Gushing from top to bottom.

or it was characterised by a "gradual descent". It was realised in nine stages:

- 1) The stage of God's unity; all types of being are of God's essence; God is the only being.
- 2) The stage of al-'aql; the intellect, the divine being, is formed; this formation is also an emanation.
- 3) al-nafs stage; the soul, which constitutes the essence of living beings and is close to the intellect in terms of quality, is formed.
- 4) The first matter stage; the constituent material of the beings that occupy space.
- 5) Universe stage; the whole that encompasses all types of beings.
- 6) Objects stage; individual beings occupying space.
- 7) The stage of the celestial spheres; the spheres of existence with distinct characteristics.
- 8) The stage of principles; the founding essences that constitute the types of beings.
- 9) The stage of minerals, plants, and animals; the three great sections where all types of beings in the universe are gathered.

Again, according to Awfi, death was a "dissolution", it was realised by the separation of the soul from the body. From the body, the soul returned to God; in this context, the return to God was "*B'uyiik dîrîJish*".

Knowledge had three stages:

- 1) In the first stage, the senses give knowledge of the lower levels of existence; knowledge of objects is provided by sense data.
- 2) The second stage; through proving, knowledge of higher beings is gained.
- 3) In the third stage, through reason and intuition, man gains knowledge of his own essence; he knows himself; to know oneself is to reach the highest stage of knowledge.

Reason was the most reliable faculty that led man to success; since *reason* was the first to emanate from God, it was also the one that was "most favourable" to God. Therefore, man was a "being of reason".

The rationalist view of the Ikhwan al-Safa community was met with a "backlash" by orthodox Islam, which considered man to be superior to death.

Attar (1119-1193), an Iranian Sufi mystic and poet, defended the view of the unity of Being and argued for the "identity" of man and God.

The source of the Sufi subjects Attar dealt with was the "Beni-Platonianism" movement, which spread to a very large area in the Islamic Middle Ages.

According to Attar, God was an unprecedented and eternal being; He was not created; He existed only by Himself; His "essence" did not require any other being other than Himself. God was not "like" the objects gathered under the concept of existence; He was a supreme light {*nur*) above all qualifications and definitions. All types of existence were in the form of "light" in the essence of God. Being was "out of" God and "transformed" into God.

To exist was to "gush forth" from the essence of God, to appear in the field of appearance. As a "light", God ascended to the field of appearance in different stages, from the highest to the lowest level, "step by step". The stages of this appearance formed the "celebrations of existence" and the different qualities of this appearance formed the "types of existence". Existence did not mean creation "out of nothing"; it meant "emergence" from the essence of God, from the invisible to the field of appearance, "coming" to the visible state. Therefore, to "exist" was to "appear", to "emanate" from the essence of God.

Man was a divine being; he was identical with God. God "expresses" in man, takes on a special form, materialises, appears. Among the species of beings, man was the "closest" to God in terms of his intellect, will, abilities, essence and spirit. Man had the "character of a speaking God". Man, the god-

Due to his divine qualities, he was the focus of the Unity of Being (*Vahdet-i V'ücut*). The divine spirit existed in man as "like/ *mh*"; the particular will was also a part of the divine will.

According to Attar, the soul was "*immortal*", "*came*" from God and would "*return*" to God, the source from which it came. Therefore, the existence of the soul "*preceded*" the entry into the body. In terms of the stage of existence, "*spirit was first and matter was second*" according to the order of origin from the divine essence. The highest of the types of existence was "*spirit*" and the lowest was "*matter*".

Death was *the "return"* of the soul to the source from which it came, that is, to God; the soul that left the body was in "*happiness*" as it returned to its source, feeling *the "joy"* of attaining immortality. The soul's stay in the body was "*separation*" because of its "*longing*" for God; death "*removes*" this separation. Knowledge was to know God; the way to know was through one's own essence; the most precise, clearest knowledge was "*self-knowledge*". He who knew himself also knew God and other kinds of beings. When one devoted oneself to God and withdrew into oneself, "*intuition*" arising from God's grace would come into play; this intuition was a "*powerful sensation, an intuition*" that provided certain knowledge and brought one face to face with God. Intuition and knowledge, knowing "*necessitated*" each other, one could not exist without the other. could not. The essence of intuition was "*love*".

Love stemmed from the "*longing for communion*" with the being of God. Since there was no being other than God, love meant "*training*" and "*orientation*" towards the divine. The first origin of love was the "*yearning*" for one's own self. Therefore, he who loves himself "*loves*" God, and he who loves God "*loves*" himself.

While God was in the invisible divine universe, He felt "*education*" for Himself by His essence; He wanted to be seen and the event of "*rushing*" took place.

In the history of philosophy, the source of knowledge and the comprehension of truth

This led to the "*emergence of epochs*" that were linked to different ways of thinking. These epochs can be categorised as follows:

A) Those who assert that knowledge is obtained through the senses; "*materialism and empiricism*". The source of this method was nature and nature was emphasised.

B) Those who assert that knowledge is not obtained through the senses but only through the ability to think; "idealist" teachings; "*idealism*". The source of these methods was the "*faculty of intellect and comprehension*", i.e. the "*faculty of thinking*", which was believed to have a productive and creative quality.

C) Those who see the source of knowledge in "*intuition*"; this method was initially used in the solution of mathematical problems. Within the scope of "*scientific intuition*", "*intuition*" is the state in which the thinker, who concentrates his/her thinking ability on a certain subject, gains the data by clarifying the result that he/she could not obtain through experimentation in an unexpected period of time through intuition. In this sense, intuitionism has a "*scientific*" quality related to psychology. It is based on obtaining a data that "*facilitates*" the solution of the thought problem. In the field of theology, intuition is perceived as a divine "*ujrari*", a divine "*Light*". In the teachings originating from Neo-Platonism, the comprehension of the truth can be achieved through "*intuition*", which has the characteristic of intuition. *It is the "only condition"* for reaching God and seeing God in His essence; it "*transcends*" all the limits of the intellect and the power of comprehension; it enables to reach the most certain truth in the shortest time. The stage called asceticism can only be reached through "*intuition*".

In Bâtînî thought, there were two sources of knowledge: "*Life*" or "*soul and sense*", which are also perceived as "consciousness".

According to this theory, which regards knowledge as a "*spiritual*" entity, the senses were misleading, and this misleadingness was due to the body, which was "*temporary, e1'um1'u*".

The soul, on the other hand, was a divine substance; therefore, the knowledge that came from it was also "*certain*", and this knowledge was linked to "faith" (belief).

The knowledge acquired through the senses connected to the body was outside the "*control*" of the believer's *taman*; the soul gave the impressions of the knowledge of its "spiritual home" and the senses of the "*transient world*". The Iranian philosopher Shahabeddin

Suhrawardi (1153-1191), the founder of the "*enlightenment* *le1seI'eseI'ese*" called "*Ishrakili1f*", inspired by Neo-Platonism and ancient Iranian-Indian beliefs, utilised the "*method of exhibition*" in examining existence, knowledge and creation. According to Him, this method was the way to reach the divine "*secret*"; universal and spiritual knowledge could be provided to the heart by "*intuition*". The

element that constituted intuition was the "*ray*"; the ray was objectively "*reflected*" in the human body, and this reflection was a reflection of the human being.

also created a "*moon of consciousness*".

Suhrawardi based his philosophy on "*lived enthusiasm*" instead of abstract thinking. According to him, since the essence of objects was formed by radiation, it could not be known "*instantly*". The universe of existence was a "*d'iizen*" going from bottom to top, that is, from matter to light. All rays converged in God, the "*ray of light*". For this reason, reason was "*unreliable*", it had to be integrated with the mysterious "*love*" that destroys doubt. Through intuition, man would "*intuit*"; step by step, he would ascend from obscurity to light; he would gain the ability to "grasp" natural and spiritual phenomena without any doubt. Through intuition based on "*observation and introspection*", man would transcend his animal existence; he would rise to the "'*masters*' of imagination" and become capable of "*receiving information*" from the invisible realm of existence.

According to him, philosophers were divided into three categories:

- 1) Those who were engaged in mystical pleasure and discovery; prophet-
such as Baiazid-i Bistami, Hallac-i Mansur;
- 2) Those who use investigative thought and observation, such as Aris-Toteles and other mystics;

3) Those who use mystical vision and discovery in addition to thinking and reasoning.

The absolute principle of all existence is the "*ray of rays*" whose fundamental characteristic is continuous illumination. It had no "*cause*" outside itself. Creation was a descent from its essence outwards through "*overflowing, effusion*" from the top downwards to all the levels of existence; in other words, there was an order from "*light to darkness*".

There were also two types of light:

- a) Abstract light; it has no form; it cannot be a quality of an object other than itself; it knows itself through itself;
- b) Incidental work: work that can be the quality of an object other than itself.

There were three forces that put man into action:

- 1) Reason is the source of understanding and knowledge;
- 2) The wild spirit creates passion, superiority, fearlessness, anger, etc;
- 3) The animal spirit creates the act of reproduction and natural instincts.

In this context, Abulberekat Baghdadi argued that the senses also have a quality that is precise and capable of providing the truth. According to him, despite their dependence on the mortal body, the senses were more precise foci of knowledge in understanding the world because the senses could control each other; one sense could correct the mistakes of the other. However, there was no such possibility for the soul.

Baghdadi's ideas spread rapidly; he formed an experimental criticism against the philosophical movements that regarded knowledge as a spiritual and divine entity. According to this approach;

As long as faith (belief) dominated reason, there was no possibility of reaching certain knowledge; reason had infallible measures and unchanging principles; the data provided by the senses gained certainty by passing through the control of reason. A person thinking according to the principles of reason could find the truth by comparing sense data with each other. The existence of the soul the "*innate knowledge*" was not sufficient to understand the world in which one lived; it could only teach the divine being.

would know.

Muhyiddin Arabi (1162- 1240), an Andalusian Arab mystic, defended the idea that all kinds of beings are God's "*gör'un'uş'û*" and said, "

³According to him, God was the unchanging source, the primary principle of all kinds of existence. He was eternal, eternal, "one", uncreated, pure mind, pure spirit, pure light, pure will. Apart from God, *there was "no being", "no becoming"*. Whatever was gathered under the concept of being was the divine appearance.

Becoming was the reflection of the divine essence, *its "appearance"* in the sensible field. Therefore, becoming is not existence out of nothing, but *a n "open" emergence from the hidden, from the invisible.*

It developed into a "*visible*" state, a "*light*".

The universe was not an "*independent*" entity, nor was it **an "auxiliary" one**; it was the appearance of the divine essence in a unity. The divine substance and the divine essence were not separate things, but "*identical*" things.

they were. Therefore, every essence was an essence, and every essence was an essence. There was no "*change, metamorphosis and time*" in the universe as a whole; these were no more than appearances. Before the universe emerged from the divine essence, every object was in a state of "secrecy", a state of "secrecy".

It was in the '*secret*' environment.

Man was the being *who "united"* the hidden universe and the visible universe, but he was not separate from the divine essence. The divine essence is this perfect in-

53. "According to ibn 'Arabî, in fact, anyone who does theology is pushing God to a single- rara;..." (Almond, Ian; fbzii *Araba*" and *Derrida/ Sufism and Va-* pzsökiim. Trans: Kadir **Filiz-**; Ayrıntı Publications; Istanbul- 2012; p, 33

sanda (*man-i kâmil*), and acquired the quality of "*speech*". For this reason, man was the "*Protecting God*" and God was the "*Speaking Man*" who took on the character of a concrete being. This separation was "*in appearance*"; in reality man and God were one. The soul, which gave "*life*" to the competent human being, "*thought*" and "*moved*" him, was the "*word*" of God.

According to Arabi, there were certain conditions for becoming a competent human being:

- 1) Certainty based on reason, arising from it;
- 2) Ecstasy with divine ecstasy;
- 3) Deep joy;
- 4) Intuition;
- 5) Comprehension of the sublime universe in its entirety.

Again, according to him, there were three stages of existence:

a) The first step, the step of divine existence, is unknowable, incomprehensible, only thought. It is an invisible absolute environment; in this environment, all qualities, many-nesses, actions, and diversities are transformed *into* the divine "*biF*".

b) The second step is the first sphere determined by being, the initial environment of all events of emergence and appearance; this sphere is visible to God and hidden to subsequent beings.

c) The third step is the second sphere of determination, the sphere in which the only becoming and the first becoming are realised; the sphere in which Muhammad, as the first example of humanity, is realised.

The emergence was the realisation of becoming according to certain stages:

- 1) Appearance in the first stage; the universe of spirits was formed-rurur; it is the highest stage of the ascent from Godhead.
- 2) The appearance in the second stage is the universe, which contains the most perfect and mature examples of all types of existence; it is the most sublime stage of the ascent from the Godhead.

rational principles, universals, and beings appear at this stage; beings are shaped according to these principles.

3) Appearance in the third stage; the universe in which objects emerge; this universe, which includes all types of beings occupying space, is the concrete form of the field of appearance s_1 .

According to Arabi, who structured his theory of wahdat al-body (Unity of Being) on two principles such as "love and intuition", all human actions were divine. **The moment** when God was closest to man was the moment when "**love**" and the "**taste**" of love reached the highest stage.

In fact, philosophy began with the thought that dealt with the "*founding principles of the universe*" and interpreted them **according to the "rules of reason"**. In the context of philosophy, every society has sought a solution to this problem; the solution it has found has become the focus of its order of thought:

- a) In some solutions, science and philosophy,
- b) Philosophy with religion in some solutions,
- c) In some solutions, science and religion were intertwined.

Philosophy's focus on the universe outside of religions **first** began in Anatolia. The "*naturalistic regions*" of Anatolia made the principles that founded the universe a problem; they saw the universe as a "*living b'ût'ûn*".

This first founding principle, which Thales called "*water*", was considered the first product of thought based on the rules of reason. This was followed by "*air*", "*fire*" and "*earth*".

With the emergence of monotheistic religions, a new solution to the question of the universe was sought: "the universe and God" were considered together;

- 1) Some thinkers saw the universe in God; they interpreted the event of "*creation*" as a "*Lislectrcation*" from God's essence.

2) Some thinkers saw God in the universe; they interpreted it as *"co-creation"*.

3) Some thinkers saw the universe in God and God in the universe; *"the unity of God and the universe"* gained weight.

Plato was the first sage to try to explain the view that existence has its most mature forms in the *"du yular'üst'û"* universe and that these forms are eternal, transforming it into a philosophical problem. *"Ideas"*, which he characterised as real and supreme beings, were examples that existed only in thought and could not be grasped by the senses.

All types of beings in the universe of appearances were *"reflections"* of these ideas. The senses could only perceive these reflections. These perceptions, in turn, *"remembered"* the ideals, which were real examples. This is why human knowledge is a *"recollection"*.

This theory, developed by Plato, significantly influenced the last monotheistic religions, Christianity and Islam: It was the source of the view that there are *"two spheres of existence"*: the visible universe and the invisible universe. Christian and Islamic theologians interpreted this Platonic conception of the universe according to their own beliefs, thus enabling the *"birth of new theories"*.

After the Renaissance, the concept of *"idea"* was given a new interpretation and *"taken away"* from theology and turned into *"one of the problems of philosophy"*.

Similarly, the concept of the intellect, i.e. the *"faculty of understanding"*, has always been a problem in the history of philosophy; the first question was whether the intellect has an existence *"independent"* of matter;

A) The materialists answered this question *"negatively"*; according to them, the understanding was *"reducible"* to matter because it *had a "material nature"*. In this context, Democritus and Epicurus, who followed him, defined the understanding as a *"subtle"*

"matter". Modern thought, on the other hand, tried to reduce materialism, the understanding, to the "hamket".

B) The idealists answered this question *"in the affirmative"*; according to them, the instant was an entity *"independent"* of matter; real existence was instantaneous, and matter could basically be reduced to "the instant".

C) The dualists gave neither an *"affirmative"* nor a *"negative"* answer to this question: according to them, matter and the instant **were** *"independent"* of each other. The conception of the moment as an *"essence"* gave rise to the concept of "soul".

In the history of civilisation, it is a widespread belief that scientific thought began with *"asking questions"* and *"investigating"* the structure and origin of the universe.

Thinking human beings have been "curious" about the universe and the types of beings they live in; they have generated questions about where they came from and where they are going; they have first *asked* themselves and then others *"questions"*.

He felt the necessity and thus *he "made his mark"* in philosophy:

A) The natural philosophers of Anatolian origin dealt with *"the universe and existence in the universe"*.

B) Sophists; *"man"* The human being was perceived as a *"being of knowledge, a being of wisdom, a being of society, a being of happiness {will}"*, etc.

C) Monotheistic religions were centred on "God"; man was perceived as a *"the being of faith, the being of belief"*, etc.

D) In Roman thought, man was perceived as a *"being of will"*.

E) In Kantian thought, he was seen as a *"being of duty"*.

F) Hans Driesch, too, emphasised a *"being of achievement"*.

G) Contemporary philosophy, on the other hand, characterised man as a *"being of culture"* as well as a natural being.

The philosophical source of the field of belief is "*idealism*" and the philosophical source of the field of thought is "*materialism*". In the context of idealism, the belief that existence exists "*before human thought*" created "*subjective idealism*", while the belief that existence exists outside human thought in a "*t'ü- mel*" or "*godlike*" thought created "*objective idealism*".

The School of Elea, which sought solutions to philosophical problems based solely on "concepts" and based this solution on a controversial basis by considering "*opposing meanings*", became the founder of the "*dialectical method*" in the history of thought. This doctrine, founded by Parmenides and developed by Zenon, was "*based on logic*". According to this doctrine, the main characteristic of the dialectical method is to "produce the act of thinking by juxtaposing two opposing entities".

The school of Elea's doctrine of logic is based on the principle that "*existence exists and is not created*". The opposite of the existent is the non-existent, and since this is "*non-existent*", it cannot be the source of the existent; in fact, the existent cannot be derived from the non-existent "*by nature*".

On the other hand, if the existent were to arise later on, it would have to come from the non-existent; whereas for the existent to arise from the non-existent would mean "*the emergence of existence from nothing*", which is "*contrary to the rules of logic*". Therefore, only the existent "*exists*" and is "*identical*" with itself. From the connection between existence and non-existence and self-identity, the principles of "*identity and non-contradiction*" of logic emerged; the basis of these principles was "*unity and invariance*". The last two terms were used by Xenophanes, who originated from Anatolia and later settled in Elea, to "prove" the existence of God.

According to Xenophanes, God existed; he was one; he was immortal; he was unchanging. These views of Xenophanes were developed by his student Parmenides by applying them to the solution of the problem of "*what is and what is not*".

Parmenides' student Zenon, on the other hand, applied his teacher's method.

He used the *mini* in the explanation of the problems of "*movement and motion*". According to him, a moving object meant that it was standing somewhere. An object standing in one place meant that it was not moving; therefore, what was thought to be moving was in fact standing in one place; since the senses deceived the human being, "*the object standing seemed to be the object moving*". The same was true for "*multiplicity*"; if the one was many, it meant that it was divided; division was the separation into infinitely small ones; "*if there were infinitely small ones, there were infinitely large ones*".

The doctrine developed by the Elea School later formed the basis of "*Aristotelian logic*". Aristotelian logic, on the other hand, gave birth to a new "*logic*" arising from "*experimental sciences*" after the Renaissance; dialectic logic, which Hegel put into practice with a new arrangement.

established the "*conflict*" of the *tik* method.

These values coming from the Anatolian Antiquity, Southeast and Central Asia were blended with Zoroastrian values and transformed into "*tasavvut'akunwa*" in Anatolian soil.

Sufism had three fundamental problems such as "*God, the universe and man*"; God was one; He was eternal, infinite and creator; He was unknowable; He had no "*identity*" among the types of being; He was pure mind, pure consciousness, pure spirit, pure instantaneous. However, above all these qualities, a "*lover*" (*nurdu*) was not created. The creation event was a "*gushing*" (emanation) from the divine essence as a light. The emanation was gradual from the highest to the lowest. The universe was the largest dimensional "*existence*" field of this divine emanation.

Plotinus, the founder of Neo-Platonism, was the first to put forward the idea of God's manifestation as a vast light, the creation of the universe as a result of His appearance. According to him, God was essentially the most intense source of light. In this source of light, there were tendencies such as "*will and love*"; however, these tendencies were "*inward*" rather than outward; they were directed towards God's own "*essence*". By virtue of this characteristic, especially in the religion of Zarathustra, God "*loved Himself*". This love and is-

In the essence; there was the ability to turn-open "*outward*". God overflowed outwards because of His "*immense love*" for His own essence. When this overflow reflected outward as an infinite light, the universe and the beings filling it were formed. This formation did not occur all at once, but "*gradually*" from the highest being to the lowest. Each stage of existence reflected God in proportion to its own "*characteristic*". Man saw only this reflection and thought of God "*reflected*" by its influence.

Anatolian Bâtınîlism adopted this Neo-Platonic view as a whole; it interpreted creation as "Love".

In ancient Iranian beliefs, especially in Zoroastrian religion, since "*work and fire*" were sacred, the idea that they had a divine quality was widespread. According to this idea, "light" was the source of all existence, the focus of goodness, beauty and sublimity. In the characterisation of light as a principle that is the source of all existence, many Eastern and Western thinkers were united in *this* view, despite the theories of monotheistic religions.

To summarise, two different beliefs were put forward on the creation event:

- 1) Creation was a "*creation out of nothing*" by God's will. The belief that God is the source of the holy books of monotheistic religions;
- 2) the belief in "*emanation*" as a light from the essence of God. Judaism; originated in polytheistic religions and Neo-Platonism.

Man was a "*chamber*" being between God and the universe, where the two merged; *he was "divine"* because of the spirit, reason and will he carried. The main element that brought man closer to God and enabled him to comprehend Him was "love" (love).

Love was the tendency to "*intuit*" God in oneself *and to "see"* God in oneself. In reality, both the one who loves and the one who is loved are "bif"; therefore, man is God and God is man.

The Philosophy of Light or emanation

"The conscience of the people did not prevent fascism; in fact, fascism and genocide took place with people of conscience.

Because their conscience tells them that they have obeyed the law.
by being clean.""⁴

Let us now take a "*stroll*" through the philosophical universe of Anatolian Alevism within the scope of the Philosophy of Light or Sudur Philosophy, which was "*nurtured and nurtured*" by the pioneering Sufis who were the perpetrators of this belief-thinking.

Anatolian Alevism explains the "*Thnri-nature-human*" relationship, which it perceives as "*thesis-antithesis-synthesis*", within the scope of the Philosophy of Light (Sudur Philosophy).

The philosophy of light argues that the light emanating from God's own essence, which is in the state of "*the essence*", undergoes "*transformations*" and thus "*alienates*" itself and takes visible forms in the universe.

According to the belief, while God was the God of himself in the *absolute* nothingness before the existence of matter and things, of movement, of time as an abstraction of movement, he had an "*essence*" that was difficult for human beings to conceive and perceive, that is, "*transcendent*" to human reason⁽⁵⁾'

The Philosophy of Light enters into a debate based on this "*ézà*" Because, at this stage, he does not find it "*hopeful*" to speak of the existence of a God. It remains "*indifferent*" to a God who is self-conscious and "*unaware*" of the infinite possibilities, abilities and powers within itself.

Again, according to belief, in the case of the law of Light Philosophy

54. Toker Nilgün; *Hnnnah Aaend'te Politik Sonunluluk Citizen So-nimluluğu*; Felsefelogos; 2004/3; Bulut Yayinevi; p, 52

55. "As we have already noted, the mirror image of evil is Ya- radihsh... Good and evil are horribly intertwined." (Eagleton, Terry; *Tat- h Violence/ Tragic Concept*. Trans: Kutlu Tunca-; Istanbul- 2012; p, 334

As a consequence of the *"beauty's tendency to be seen"*, God wants an "eye" to look at Himself and a *"heart"* to recognise Himself and to be His dwelling place in the "hippic" environment which is unthinkable for man.

The Philosophy of Light begins with this *"necessity-obligation"*: God is *"alienated"* from himself. With the appearance of alienation, *"nothingness"* evolves into a state of *"latent"* possibilities.

In parallel with evolution, God becomes self-conscious; in the necessary source of the creation of all the objective and spiritual aids, He attains the distinction of *"ta idi min"*; He gains personality-identity; whereas before He was an unrelated God in *"fiiplik"*, now He becomes *"Truth, Reality, Truth"* or *"A k"*.

Afterwards, from the first level of light, Hakk; almost every §It descends to the first intellect (*akt-i evveJ*), through which everything is considered to have been created. Thus begins the movement of evolution's *"alqalan e ri"* (*kavs-i n'ü- zu1*) descending from the divine origin (*âlem-i gaQp*) to the world perceptible to the senses and accessible to knowledge (*Clem-i uhud*).

Then, one by one, and with each step, a little more of God.

In the *"uzaMa aca "* bişimde; the information given to the intellect *"be-*

/As a "stage of development", the belief in Orkan angels, prophets,

prophets, saints, believers, non-believers, jinn-

§demons, animals, plants and natural elements

The *"intellect"* is created by the *"zuhlari"* arising from these nine intellects.

God, after becoming the Truth and gaining potential, undergoes *"transformations"*, i.e., by going through stages characterised as *"lesser Iraq"*, as *"lesser Iraq"*, as *"lesser itself"*, and finally descends to the *"natural e/e- menf"*, *"sat cevheZ"*.

Thus the movement of the *"pevrim"*, the *"alqalan e ri"*, which is perceived as the *"circle of existence"* in belief, descending from the sacred origin to the visible universe, is completed.

This first wound of *"Vamlu pemßeN"* is entirely a *"belief"*

is a product. This idealist aspect, this idealism, which is reached through the knowledge of the heart (*intuition, reason1*), which is explained by giving priority to subtle knowledge, which is perceived as temporary visible realities, which are "*immutable, eternal and eternal*" in comparison to the objective world, is nothing but the "*culinary idiosyncrasy*" of the "*lunar/reliance on metaphysics*", which exists before nature, which develops through the dialectical method and *becomes "naturalised"* and finds itself in human consciousness.

The metaphysical enlightenmentists, who say that first there was an "*absolute thought*" and everything came into being from this absolute thought, and the Anatolian Alevi belief, which says that first there was a God in the "*blissful nothingness*" and everything became "*visible reality*" through His "*transcendence*", that is, through His dialectical "*transformation*", show a complete "overlap".

Again, we see here the phenomenon of "*jumping from belief to reason*" of metaphysical enlightenment: In this context, the "*idealist*" aspect of the cycle, although it appears to be "*first1-creative*" in the Philosophy of Light, is in reality a justification for the "*object1-process-materialist basis of thought*".

It is an element of "*assumption*" created by a "*collective method*" in order to descend from belief to thought. More precisely, it is the product of the "*alienation*" created by the bâ- tmî identity, which reacts to "*external thinking-running*", "*alienating*" itself in order to sanctify the "*natural process - human action*", which it perceives as the real facts.⁵⁶

Religious and mystical philosophy; God's direct
 "There is a general belief that it is '*reason*'. Anaxagoras and Heraclitus, in their ancient Greek-Anatolian designs, de- rationalised the "flow" with their concepts of "nous" and "*logos*". Anatolian Bâtınîli-

56. "Believing is one of the basic conditions of existence peculiar to human beings and carries an excess compared to knowing: knowing is the tendency to acquire the properties of existence as they are, while believing is the tendency to acquire them both as they are and as they are not." (Nutku Uluğ; İnanmanın Felsefesi Özbakışıcı Bir Giriş; Alan Yayıncılık; Ankara- 2012; p, 1)

In this case, the intellect is the first realisation of Haqq, which is perceived as a potential god.

is the "active force" that emerges through its transformation.

In Bâtinism, God first created the intellect and then, with its help, the soul: The intellect was "*complete*", the soul "*incomplete*". The universe was formed out of this "*movement of incompleteness due to the desire for completeness*".

When the soul (*nafs-i ash*), envying the perfection of the intellect-i-k1, began to "*rotate*" in order to reach its perfection, the heavens were first formed; and from their rotation, bodies (*objects, animals, plants*) appeared. The soul-ash "*divided into particulars*" and "*entered into beings*". Among beings, only the human being "*embodied*" the "intellect Iüif" in his own personality.

In Anatolian Alevism's view of the universe, the intellect-i ash {*Adem-i mana-sabık-*) is called *nafs-i ash* (*J-favva-imana-tali-*). In other words, intellect ash is the male principle (active principle) and *nafs-i ash* is the female principle (passive principle). The universe was born from the opposition of these two principles. The identity of Adam-i mana and Eve-i mana means "*all life*".

The principle of the association of opposites was also recognised by primitives: This is why primitives did not speak of favours such as joy, success, happiness, etc., because they believed that to speak of them would realise *their "opposite"* or call forth their opposite⁽⁵⁷⁾

The belief that universal formation arises from the "*contradiction of opposites*";

57. "..., there can be no creative act that is not rooted in the harm it does to others..., the legacy it bequeaths to humanity is always a dirty legacy, it is both a gift and a poison... This is a situation which Ibsen often dramatised by a deadlock between the past and the present..., the dirty roots of present success bring the plague back to you, or the struggle to eliminate present unreality in the name of the future strangles the future at the moment of its birth. It is impossible to live without accrued debts; but to pay them or to ignore them often seems fatal." (Eagleton, Terry; *The Tragic Concept of Sweet Violence*. Trans: Kutlu Tunca-; Istanbul- 2012; p,300)

- a) In Indian design; Barahma-Shiva opposition;
- b) In Greek design, the Eros-Anteros opposition;
- c) Chinese design; Yin-Yang opposition;
- d) In the Anatolian Bâtmî design, it was realised through the transcendence of the opposites of Intellect- Kül -Nafs-i Kül or Love-Nafs.

For example, in Greek mythology, "*Antreros*" (opposite love) is the brother of "*Eros*" (love). Their mother Aphrodite gave birth to "*Anferos*" for the better development of "*Eros*": Eros could develop only when he was near Anteros; he rejoiced when he was near him and cried when he was far away.

Heraclitus, seeing in the "*personified*" worlds of the consciences reflected in the sky the "**silent**" traces of the common laws of objectivity, formulated the "*fundamental law of dialectics*": "*the law of the unity and elimination of opposites*".

The mystic Pythagoras was no exception: the world-against a "*counter-world*" he called "*Antilchton*".

he planted it.

As can be seen, in almost all mythologies the creation is the result of the "love" of "*male and female iliren*" for each other.

In Bâtmî philosophy, love means "*love of God*"; sexual love, on the other hand, is the love for the "*opposite sex*", which is perceived as the manifestation of God in order to attain the love of God. In the history of philosophy, the assertion that beings are not "*monadic*" and that there are "*irreconcilable opposites*" between their qualities and essences has been a subject of much debate. This

The debates can be categorised as follows:

A) Naturalist philosophers of Anatolian origin argued that opposites are "*qualities*". They stated that the change in the structure of objects was due to the "*ratio of union*" between the constituent elements.

a) According to Thales, all objects consisted of a constituent principle called "*water*". As a result of the solidification or loosening of "*water*", beings acquired qualities such as solid, soft, fluid, volatile, hot, cold, etc.

b) According to naturalist philosophers such as Heraclitus, Anaximenes, Empedocles, on the other hand, only the "*founding principle was changing*" and the ratio in the formation of objects remained as a "*form*".

B) Rational philosophers considered the problem of opposites as a "*concept*" arising from the principles of reason. For example, in the triad of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, opposites were related not to the "*essence*" of beings but to their "*qualities*". Because they did not have the problem of "*with*", which constitutes the essence of existence.

C) With the emergence of monotheistic religions and Christianity, philosophy acquired a new content and turned into the "*science of God*": Problems such as "*God-God-human*" and "*creation*" came to the fore: "*faith*" replaced reason; "*creation*" replaced the naturalistic phenomenon of "*becoming*"; and God replaced the principle of existence.

D) Neo-Platonism made God, the event of "*creation*", the focus of thought; it argued that all kinds of existence were the manifestation and appearance of the essence of God; "*opposites*" reached "*unity*" in His essence.

E) The humanism movement re-examined the problem of "*man-evan-Tafır1*": Faith was replaced by "*reason*"; theology based on faith was replaced by *philosophy which placed faith "under the control of reason"*. The God-universe problem ceased to be a problem of faith and became a "*human problem*". God was supreme, immortal, the most competent being, the creator, the best, the most knowledgeable, the most beautiful, the most virtuous. However, there were "*opposites, contradictions, inconsistencies- SIZİ1 dY*" in the types of beings that were accepted as His creation. These situations were "*incompatible with the essence*" of God. It was not possible to solve the problem with the "*traditionalist*" methods of theology.

F) The problem of "*God-ewan-human-creation*" was also the fundamental problem of Sufism. God, due to His superior qualities, transformed all the negative situations in the universe that seemed to be "*contradictory, opposing, inconsistent*" into "*unity*" and "*harmony*" in His own being.

Kaygusuz Abdal's idea that the idealist side of the cycle is a "*woo-*" The following lines explaining that he is the product of "*gu*" are striking:

At that time there was no such thing
as this ka'inat Every adjective was
nihan in Zat

This attribute was enshrouded in the
essence This body was null and yet it
was light

Neither a prophet nor a saint existed
at that time, and every attribute was
immersed in the Self.

The earth and the sky were a secret
in a treasure, there was no duality,
there was only one

This approach finds its clearest form in the verses of the nineteenth century Bektashi poet Edip Harabi (1853-1917): Harabi in his long poem "*Human sacrifice*":

While Allah and the world did not yet
exist, We created the moment and
declared it
While there was no place worthy of Hakk, we
took him to our house and made him our host.

He had no name yet He had no body,
let alone a name He had no clothes
and no picture We moulded him and
made him just like a human being

This is where we merged with Allah We
entered the dottai amaya and settled
down We talked about the sim küntü
kenzü there We made his name
Rahman.

When its essence becomes evident
We created this universe together, and
we made this heaven and this universe,
and we have made its name and its
mark a world.

We have made the heavens and the
earth seven layers The universe was
completed in six days We have
created all these creatures in it We have
provided them with provisions and
bestowed them

We have made paradise without any
realisation We have given the jewellery
to the beauties We have made every
nation happy with various promises and
made them happy.

We've earned hell is pretty deep
We have made a bridge mismatch on top
of it, which is much thinner than hair and
sharper than a sword.

Although the world came into existence with
the command of kün, we travelled the
Throne and stood still for a time, we decreed
the people of Adam so that this universe
would not remain empty.

The one who has wisdom knows the
mystery of the sceptical Ism-i Azam
We kneaded the mud and made Adam
We have revived a spirit from our soul

Adam and Eve were united
They said, "What a beautiful place we have
found!" They ate wheat in paradise.

Many people came from Adam and Eve,
Prophets and guardians were blessed
One hundred thousand times the world
was filled and emptied.

We gave Salih a camel, and it came
out in the rock, and many did not
believe in it.

For a time we made the Ashâb keffi sleep,
we made Hazrat Moses study in Tur, we
made Shid a sulha, we wove cloths, we
had Idris cut and made him a caftan.

We made Suleiman a sultan in Derh,
we made Ayyub a pitying man, we
made Ya'qub cry, we made him nalan,
we made Moses a shepherd for
Shu'ayab.

We had Joseph thrown into the well, we
had him sold as a swan in Egypt, we had
Ze1iha married to his mother, we made the
dungeon a dungeon because of his
wrongdoing.

We made the Prophet David play the
instrument We saved Lot and Hud from an
accident Look how we made Nemrud look
We made the vineyard a garden for
Abraham

We sent a sacrifice from heaven at the cost
of Ismail, Halil-i Rahman We made the
belly of the fish a place for the Prophet
Yunus for a long time

We put the Virgin Mary in a mosque, and there we gave
birth to Jesus without a father.
We made Zechariah in a tree and made his
belly rizan.

In the city of Jerusalem, in the city of
Jerusalem, in the city of Jerusalem, in the
River Jordan, in the river of virtue, we made
John and Jesus uran one day in order to
purify them.

We've had our fair share of flirting.
We have done a lot of work with this
Prophet We have brought another
Prophet We have made every pole of
the Qur'an the Qur'an

Muhammad Mustafa came to the world to
invite the people to faith We made
Murtaza his companion

A Prophet can never be compared to
the Mother, the King of the Prophets,
the Messenger of Allah He is the
owner of the world and the world to
come We have made the Prophet
ascended.

We united with Hak-Muhammad-Ali We
went to Ka'ba Kavseyn together We had
many conversations in that station We
travelled in Leylet'ü1 israa

Do not think that every human
understands these words Bird language
is the language of birds, this Suleiman
understands The scepticism of this
mystery is understood by the arifan
Because we have made pinhan from the ignorant

We were with Hak and Hak in the
eternity Ruzi elest in kallu belide in
the place of Hûda in bezmi celide We
saw your Cemal and we believed.

A human being who does not know the
realm of wahdat is an animal that has
remained in the capacity of a human being
Hazrat Süphan is not the same as us We
have made this clear with the Qur'an

Our words are very certain Our words are
very certain Our words are very certain Our
words are very certain Our words are very
certain Our words are very certain Our words
are very certain We have declared the truth

For those who see the palace of wahdat,
for those who see Hakk, hakkal yakin, for
those who know this sım Harabi, for
those who know this sım Harabi, in the
square of unity, we have been wandering

In his poem "*Bir Şah Olsam*" (If I were a *Shah*), Ibreti, one of the powerful poets of the last period, challenges the orthodox beliefs that see the "*idealistic*" side of the cycle as "*prior/creative and eternal*"; that suggest "*locking on*" to one's faith; and that try to "*make yesterday*" the philosophy of servitude:

If I were a Shah, I would demolish churches
and mosques, I would build schools for all
human beings, I would eradicate ignorance.

I would have built factories
everywhere, I would have banished
duality in this series
I used to look at the world with one eye

I used to know the real people Allah I would
not worship anyone other than Him billah
Neither Kaaba nor Beytullah I used to sow a
barley in its place

There would be no heaven but humanity
Jesus, Moses, Muhammad would
disappear I would untie the bonds of
religions

The rich and the poor would always be
one, I would be a remedy for the helpless
troubles Neither giaour nor Muslim
would be left, I would lead them all to
one path.

I would work day and night for the
nation I would be a useful bird, of course
I would be a river beyond the sun I
would flow to new horizons

If I could see that day, my face would
smile People in the world would rejoice
Neither a weapon nor an atom would
remain I would pour it into a great sea

I would plant a flag in the world and go
away.

The second half of the cycle in the Philosophy of Light begins with the movement of the *"ascending curve"* (*kavs-i uruç*), which moves away from the *"natural eJemen pure substance"*, which appears as the farthest point from the Truth, away from *"alienation"* and undergoes *"transformations"* in such a way that God becomes more and more *"Himself"* with each step.

In the Philosophy of Light, with the descent from belief to *"object"*, *"the divinity of God also reaches its conclusion"*. The movement of the ascending curve of the circle of existence is entirely on the basis of *"materialism"* / *"materialist thought"*: The *"material-social universe"*, although perceived as an apparent *"creation"* of the divine essence, is in reality nothing but a *"predecessor"*.

Since the final point of alienation is the *"objectification"* of *"the thing that is the most pure god"*, it symbolises the *"natural ement/pure substance"* or its *"mind"*, *"spirit"*, a stage of *"light"* (emanation) in which God *cannot "do"* his godhood.

At this point, the objects of *"earth, water, air, and fire"*, which the Enlightenment of the First Age emphasised as the *"fundamental principles"* of animate and inanimate nature, are captured. And this is the beginning of a process of *"moving away from alienation"* step by step in its own laws/rules, outside of God's knowledge and guidance, from idealism to metar- yalism.

In the circle of existence, the transformations of the *"ascending tendency"* gradually evolve from the abstract to the concrete. In the process of time, which is nourished by the perception that everything revolves around the earth and which comes to consciousness as the *"abstraction"* of the movement following the arc of a circle, the nine spirits are *"concretised"* in the form of Atlas, Zodiac signs, Zü- hal, Customer, Merih, Sun, Zühre, Utarit and Moon as the divine places *where the "visions of the knowledge"* given to the nine intellects are determined. From these nine celestial planets, elements such as *"warmth-coldness"*, *"sandiness-aging"*, etc. emerge as qualities that prioritise the objective process/life in particular and exist in the form of *"opposites"* (unity of opposites).

Here, Chinese, Indian, Iranian, Greek-Anatolian ideas

We see the exact "*traces*" of the philosophy of the Enlightenment, which evolved in the form of a combination. The "*intuition*" that the infinite diversity of the visible world has opposing forces such as "*sand-age, light-darkness, warmth-coldness, emptiness-fullness, plus-minus*", etc., and that this is the "*driving*" force of development/change, also occupies an important place in the Philosophy of Light. It is this approach that feeds the sacred trinity of "*God-nature-human*" in the form of "*thesis-antithesis-synthesis*".

According to the Philosophy of Light, from the relationship of the "*four elements and qualities*", which are perceived as eternal and infinite, the "*ultimate world*", i.e. "*the world of inanimate things, the world of plants and the world of animals*" emerges.

The "*realm of animal moments*", which appears as the last link of the "*ascending tier*", the ninth and last stage of light, ends with the stage of the "*human being-i kâmil*", which represents the complete human being who reaches the Truth by ascending in degrees.

Looking at the Cycle as a whole, God, in a sense, "*denies*" his existence by transferring himself to the natural element/pure substance. He is "*incapable*" of "*knowing*", let alone directing, an "*objective process*" that carries its potential within itself. God, who wants to recognise/know this world of which he is ignorant, and in this way to "*put an end to his own ignorance*", "*needs*" the human being who contains the divine essence the most, that is, who is God the most. Through the "*human being*" in general and the "*carnal human being*" in particular, he finds in faith the opportunity to "*know/recognise*" this world, which is blessed as the world of temporary visible realities, and which in essence is nothing but an "*object- nel sümç*" composed of elements with material properties in the sense of "*being*" and "*phenomenon*".

"*Orientation to the object*" has been one of the important problems discussed by philosophy. In Aristotle's philosophy, the object was an entity with certain "*qualities*", whether it existed in the universe of thought or in the sensible universe. Therefore, it was the source of knowledge.

Aristotle's view that objects are particular entities

Aristotle argued that they are not like the kinds of beings Plato called "*ideas*" but "*sensible beings*".

It was this problem of "being" that formed the basis of the disagreement between Aristotle, who characterised objects as "*real beings*", and Plato, who interpreted them as a reflection of the "*idea*".

The German philosopher Franz Brentano (1838-1917) developed his view, which originated in Aristotelian philosophy: And he defined two spheres of existence, one related to "*thought*" and the other to "*imagination*".

According to Aristotle, every attempt, every endeavour is directed towards an "*object*"; however, this object was the goal to be reached and characterised as the best. Therefore, "*orientation*" aimed to reach the final stage. The intended goal was "*outside*" the orientation, the power (mind) that gave rise to the orientation.

If the factor enabling the orientation were inside the orientee, the orientation would take the form of "*self-fighting*". In this case, the orientate would also be "*its own*" goal.

Brentano does not think like this: According to him, the orientation that necessitated an object was "*psychological*", related to the end of knowledge". A relationship in the physical sense required the "*existence*" of the elements in the relationship. However, the nature of the psychological relation was different; when something was thought, the existence of the thinker was "*necessary*", while the existence of the thought was "*not necessary*". This was the reason why we could "*think of objects that do not exist*".

In fact, Brentano's view was not new; Platon's It was a "decoy" form of the understanding of "*idea*".

The problem of the "*place and nature*" of the object led to the emergence of "*opposing*" currents such as idealism and materialism in the history of philosophy.

In the Philosophy of Light and at the end of the cycle, on the grounds of man's "*need*" not for God, but for God's "*need*" for man; self-god/lord; self-creator/self-former

The human being, who comes to the fore as the resurrector, appears as a "warrior" who "revolts" against almost all kinds of oppression, "taking his brain and body to heaven".

The "god of faith" or the "god of faith", shaped as the final state of a collective consciousness *that has been "inverted"* by consecration, and perceived as the firstless-infinite, sits on its feet in the guise of a "talking god" or a "god-man". The fictionalised god is "embodied" in the fictionaliser. God becomes a speaking/acting being "in human form".

As a natural extension of this dialectical transformation, he never shows his own "alienated god as a witness"; he does not "worship" Him in this context; on the contrary, he blesses Him by showing himself as a "witness"; he prefers that man, whom he perceives as a speaking god, "worship" man.

The belief that God is like a human being and behaves with human behaviour is called "anthropomorphism" (anthropomorphism). The source of this idea is the Ionian region in Anatolia.

This passion for primordial animism (animism) gave birth to the scientific understanding of "living materialism" (hilozoism). Seyit

Nesimi (...-1404) dramatically explains the understanding of anthropotheism or anthropomorphism with the following sentences: "*The prostrated and the prostrator became one; the prostrator took the attribute of the prostrated... Allah has manifested and appeared in Adam. Do not be a loser and prostrate yourself to Adam! Know that the human being was cut from head to toe as Hak and became Hak; therefore, you too have become Hak.*"

Prostrate to the prostrate!"

In ancient philosophy, "human happiness" was one of the fundamental problems: One of the solutions to this problem was "spiritual serenity". According to the theory developed by Epicurus (342-271 B.C.), happiness could only be achieved through "spiritual discipline".

This theory was subjected to wide interpretations in the following period; especially in the Middle Ages, it was combined with religious beliefs and called "god-

science". Thus, spiritual serenity, which was a wise concept in Epicurus, was significantly "*distanced*" from its source by the theologians.

In medieval theology, spiritual serenity came to mean "turning away" from one's surroundings, passions and temporal beings, giving oneself to God and reaching maturity. There were two ways of doing this:

- a) Introversion and
- b) Do not be satisfied with less.

The person who successfully applied these two methods would reach spiritual "*equilibrium*"; this was what God wanted from the mature/competent person...

In the history of philosophy, the steps dealing with the human being have put forward different views; they have dealt with the human being "*in a certain aspect*" rather than in its entirety.

The Stoic school, which considered the human being as a "*being of will*", argued that happiness could be achieved *through "wise maturity" and by bringing* all actions "*under the control of the will*". The control of the will was to concentrate human behaviour in a certain direction, especially to limit emotional actions. In the "*control of the will*" proposed by Epikte- tos (50-138), one of the leading Neo-Stoicians, the main problem was "*enduring pain*". This suffering could be "*spiritual*" or "*bodily*". One's duty was to concentrate one's will on a certain subject, to "*free*" oneself from the influence of one's emotions and to make oneself "*emotionless*". This view formed the basis of Roman philosophy in the following period; it deeply influenced Christian thought, especially the understanding of religion developed by the Church Fathers; "*the soul is free*".

It was regarded as the focus of "*self-training*"; it opened a channel of "*self-training*".

In the land of Islam, the "*elimination*" of the body and soul requirements for a happy and immortal life in the divine universe

"lifting up" was the only way to reach God. The tendency to withdraw from society, to withdraw into oneself and not to think of any object other than God gradually turned into the maxim that the only way to reach God was "to endure suffering".

In Islamic heterodoxy and Bâtınîlik, a person who reaches *"spiritual serenity"* is called a perfect human being. God appeared in the heart of the perfect man in a vast silence, in an unlimited serenity; his heart was God's "house", his language was God's *"tongue"*. Such a stage of maturity was reached through love and knowledge of the heart. Knowledge of the heart is *the "spiritual light"* that provides "maturity" in serenity.

As regards *the "de-socialisation" of belief in the "social process"*, which is perceived as *"additional-nature"* in the Philosophy of Light: In this channel, the orthodox religious belief, which is a product of the civilised human mind and which *"alienates and ossifies"* outside the boundaries of the *"laws of nature/society"*, is brought down *"from the sky to the earth"*. Under the guise of the *"independence"* of man's "respect" for man, for humanity, and gradually for the environment, nature and society, it is embodied in *"social labour"*, in other words, in the *"exchange value"* in *"unity"* or *"living labour"*. Orthodox religious belief is *"transformed"* in such a way that it is *"freed from alienation"* and reduced to *"social consciousness"*.

Thus, the Philosophy of Light, which embodies faith in human beings and carries human beings to *"salvation"* by bringing faith under sovereignty, this time embodies religion in social labour and carries society to *"salvation"* by establishing the sovereignty of those who participate in the process of social work over the products of social labour.

By assuming an *"objective process"*, a *"materialist opening"* on the basis of the identity of *"God-nature-human"*, which God can only learn through the perfect human being, Alevis-Bektashis *"liberated"* themselves from being enslaved to their own *"alienated collective sciences"* and *"liberated"* themselves from the bondage of metaphysical enlightenment.

"stepping" into materialist enlightenment by "pushing" its limits "out".

But at the same time, this "crucial" point of the Philosophy of Light or Water is its "weakest" link. Because it is both *the "harvesting" ground* of the product of the intellect, which develops on the basis of the "f2arman/amma"/materialist thought of the social human consciousness in the "sllrs" of nature/social life, and a platform for "jumping" to the "sacred origin"; it is the domain of metaphysical enlightenment.

It was the "Anatolian Sufism", structured on the understanding of Wahdat-i Body/Wahdat-i Existence, that gave philosophy this coherence and "loved" it from idealism to materialism.

Seeing living and non-living nature as the manifest form of the divine essence is in fact nothing but a different expression of perceiving God in the form of *"the collection of objects"*.

This is the realisation in Anatolian soil of Materialist Naturalism, which "abandoned" the "spirit-prioritising" Intrinsic Naturalism.

It is this "materialist essence" that carries the Philosophy of Light or Sudur to the present day and makes it *ever-recurrent*. Under the guise of reducing faith to the life view of the perfect human being and religion to society's view of the universe, it is the "respect", "love", "devotion" for human "vision" and social "end". It is the essence *that "embraces social rebellion"* from the Middle Ages, when it was shaped and structured as a semi-divine *"fundamentalist popular opposition"*, to the present day, *and is the "party"* against inequality, exploitation and contempt. From that day to today, from today to tomorrow, the "idea" of a society where there are no classes, where man does not oppress man, *has not been "chased"* with sincere excitement, *has not been constantly "kept alive"*.

According to this idea of society, the earth is an area that all human beings should utilise "in common". In this field, everyone should be compensated for their labour. In a society, all bi-

Plato was the first sage to put forward the idea of the "*collective use*" of the earth's assets, especially the production areas, as a philosophical problem. Plato expressed this view in his work entitled "*Politeia*", and called it as a "*management principle*".

The idea of "mutual benefit" from the products of the earth has been one of the important problems addressed by Sufism.

Under the influence of Neo-Platonism, which also originated from Plato, the idea of "*mutual benefit*" from the products of the earth has been one of the important problems that Sufism has dealt with.

This situation, which is applied only to "*assets*" by some thinkers, has been defended with an understanding that the ancients also see a "maf" due to the "*sapraa*" or "jrarıı/sama" that appears under the siege of "*patriarchal*" values, as in Babylonia.

Alevi Sharia is Materialism

"... the equality of death before the bomb is equivalent to equality before God. "⁸

After having traced the "serurenin?" of matter and existence, and after having "*examined*" the materialist sources of the materialist understanding of existence in the bâtmî view of evolution, we can now discuss what "*Alevi shari'ah*" means in the philosophical dimension.

In the philosophical dimension, "*Alevi Sharia*" was perceived as the objective world that appeared to the believer as the form of the divine essence that had become visible realities.

In Alevi philosophy, God is not known by his "weaknesses" but by his "attributes": There is no perception of God beyond his attributes. For example, it is like electricity: We perceive electricity

58. Boer, Roland; *Criticism of Paradise'F Marxism and Theology*. -Trans: Melih Pekdemir-; Ayrıntı Publications; Istanbul- 2013; p, 151

It does not enter us in its "weakness", that is, it does not stand before our eyes in the form of matter, but we perceive it in its "qualities"; sometimes we recognise it by its lunar quality, sometimes we recognise it by its heat-forming quality, sometimes we recognise it by its cold-forming quality. It is not correct to speak of electricity as "existence" if it is stripped of all these qualities. The way it appears with its qualities makes it "known" to us. In the same way, God makes himself known to us by the "forms" in which he appears.

In this context, the objective world is the curtain of "cemai" in the sense of expressing all the attributes of God. The arif "*perceives*" the reality behind this curtain, "looks" at it with the eye of the soul, and "sees" God in every glance. This understanding is called "*Mdet-i Mevcut*" (Existence) in Alevi philosophy.

In Sunni orthodox belief, God is separate from the world and is the absolute creator. Bâtinism, on the other hand, "*unites*" God and the world; God is the "*manifestation*" of the world, and the world, which is perceived as the manifest form of God, is God *himself*. Therefore, man is the world of sugra (small âlem): God is âlem-i ekber (*b'û- yûk âiem*). In the words of Hacı Bektaş Veli;

"The universe is Adam and Adam is in Adam".

Although orthodox beliefs divide existence into two parts, "*the creator*" and "*the created*", Anatolian Bâtinism sees existence as a whole. Duality disappears; what is seen in nature is the "*manifestation*" of God and exists only with him; the creator and the created are "one". There is not a "*creation*" but a "*begetting*". Everything is God; therefore, there is no "*creator*" and no "*creature*"; there is only a divine "*being*"; the material world is the "*manifestation*" of the divine being.

Alevi Philosophy uses the concept of Wahdat-i Mevcut (*Oneness of Existence*) instead of the traditional Sufi concept of Wahdat-i Body (*unity of being*). In the context of the unity of being, the term '*v'ûcut*' in the Wahdat-i Body, which means the unity of the body, has both the meaning of '*gâvde*' and '*vaso-*

lan " meaning, it wants to avoid a "double meaning", a "misunderstanding". He prefers to use the term 'existent', which more clearly describes the existent.

Wahdat-i Mevcut means *"the unity of the existent"*; it is "nonsense" to think of an immaterial, non-existent non-existent beyond the existent, i.e. it is *"impossible"* to accept a God without an objective universe. God always exists with matter and being, with the existent.

Sheikh Bedrettin said that *"nature and God are one and the same thing"*. According to him, the absolute being in which differences, contradictions and opposites disappeared was God as *"one"* and nature or the universe as *"many"*. The absolute being appeared in the form of matter and spirit, and it was impossible to separate them from each other; they were *"coequal"*. Therefore, there would be no *"Antichrist"* or *"Mahdi"* as signs of the apocalypse, and the apocalypse would not break out; Heaven and Hell were symbols of the *"world"*. In the context of the Koran, the verses were in the *"same"* situation.

In other words, God is the sum total of all *"animate and inanimate substances"* in nature in the *"gross"* sense - which is a conception of gross materialism - and as understood by Materialist Naturalism. In the context of intellectualist materialism, *God is the sum total of abstract values in the sense of "law/rule/principle that enables things to exist and is common to things that exist"*.

is the science of God".

Whichever way it is understood, in Alevi Philosophy, when one thinks of Sharia, one thinks of *"matter, object, heir"*, and beyond this, *"objective universe"*, because this is the manifest form of God.

This understanding coincides with the *"materialist understanding"*, which asserts that nature is independent of human consciousness: everything that exists independently of consciousness is *"exist- lectic"*. On the other hand, it coincides with the *"materialist conception"*, which considers nature to be *"the 'product' of consciousness"* and which says that *"what exists is in reality"*

It conflicts with the "metaphysical idealist understanding which asserts that the non-existent, non-existent beings exist and exist.

The source of the doctrine of Wahdat-i Body or Wahdat-i Mev- cut, which is based on the assertion that all beings in the universe are "identical" with God, is the "*DO dtEftT1G1lk*" understanding of ancient philosophy, which came to belief in the form of the manifestation of natural dialectics. Because, from a philosophical point of view, polytheism is based on Nature-Godism. In this understanding, God is not the creator or maker of the universe, but God himself. In the following period, Anatolian Sufism, following this trace, "*resurrected*" Naturalism or polytheism with the understanding of Being-Unity-Mutualism, and while resurrecting it, "*it did not include Humanism, which is the expression of the social dialectic in the form of belief*".

The basic idea of the belief in the "*unity-cooperation-unity*", which has taken countless forms in the "*hands*" of many thinkers, is the assertion of the "tennis" of the universe with its nature, God, man and the universe. In this conception, the single "*essence*" is connected to God; in a kind of Hegelian approach, God is "*naturalised and innumerably equalised, appearing as various beings*".

This design entered the agenda of humanity as an important phenomenon that saved people from "*yat lIZIH*": The overwhelming feeling of loneliness "*disappeared*", and the perception of death "*disappeared*" completely, because there was no death, there was a return to the "self" by changing frost.

In conclusion, we can say the following: Perceiving the universe as a manifestation of the divine essence is essentially a "materialist" understanding.

The Sufis, who are the bearers of this understanding, i.e. those who are the ahl al-bātin, deny the orthodox Shari'ah, which they perceive as the "*science of the zāhirfñ*" (i.e. the Sunni Shari'ah). They turn towards "marifat", which they perceive as the science of the subconscious. In the context of marifat, while "*questioning*" orthodox Islām under the guidance of reason, they believe in five fundamental forces for the creation of the universe:

1) God, who is before all things, is not the creator, but only the beginning and principle of becoming; becoming does not begin with His will, but only with Him. In the Philosophy of Light, God wanted to appear when He was a hidden treasure in a state of absolute beauty in nothingness where there was no visible reality; in the context of realising the phenomenon of "*finishing*", He first created man and then the universe for man. However, since one who has a child is called a father, God would not be called God if there were no man and universe. Therefore, if there is no man, there is no God; for the existence of God is the existence of man.

2) Secondary; that which comes after the existent; intellect; male principle. God, who wanted to be known, underwent a transformation and became Haq in the sense of a potential God; from Haq came the intellect, or universal intellect.

3) Cedd; the ability of matter to form, nafs; female principle. From the conflict and unity of the intellect, which is perceived as the male principle, and the nafs, which is perceived as the female principle, matter was shaped and "appeared" (*the law of the unity of opposites*).

4) Conquest; the space, the place in which the formation will take place.

5) Imagination; the time in which the formation will take place.

The universe is, first and foremost, existent; it is primordial and eternal; it has neither been created nor will be destroyed; there is an ongoing "*becoming*"; this becoming is "*material*"; it continues through the reciprocal effects of the active male principle and the passive female principle, an understanding of "*materialism that prioritises science*". The creation and continuation of the universe is explained not by supernatural forces but by "*natural forces*".

59. "The consecrated concept resists change in order to remain static;... Whereas the unconsecrated concept is open to change, flexible, malleable. The concepts of philosophy and science are always malleable; the definitions made with these concepts are open to new definitions in the future. The consecrated concept is closed in on itself; if it were not closed, it could not be consecrated. Consecration, the concept ->>

Unfortunately, this "*materialist*" opening, perceived as Sharia, could not be preserved: Time was filled with "*empty beliefs*" and pushed into the mire of idealism; pure, rational, humane and pure philosophy was transformed into "irrationalities".

It can be said as follows: The Sufi understanding of the human being as *the "basis"*, especially the peak reached by Hallac-i Mansur, demonstrated that "*God is manifest in man*" with a Hegelian thought centuries before Hegel.

The Kalenderi sheikh Barak Baba, one of the Sufis of the XIVth century;

"Whoever has seen the face of that beauty has in reality seen Him; the Absolute beauty has appeared, but again in human form.
covered his face"

The same Barak Baba expresses in a "black humour" way that there cannot be a perception of God outside of objects and human beings. The same Barak Baba expresses in the form of "*black humour*" that there cannot be a perception of God outside the object and man as follows:

"In appearance I am the son of Adam, but in reality I have a witness that I am his father."

In one of his poems, Kaygusuz Abdal expresses
He questions the orthodox God as follows;

"You kneaded Adam out of clay and made
him, and what do you think of it, what do you
think of it, what do you think of it, what do
you think of it, what do you think of it, what
do you think of it?"

It takes it out of history, freezes it, eternalises it. The consecrated concept stops time, promises immortality... When the concepts sanctified by religion are passed through the historical sieve, they descend to the earth again." (Nutku Uluğ; *Innmanın re7sefesi / Özbakbakışıcı Bir Giriş*; Alan yayıneilik; Ankara 2012; p. 74-75)

Are you a grocer and what do you do with
the scales? You have nothing to do, what
do you do with your heart? What do you
do with weighing the sin of the servant?

Let the tar cauldron be poured out Let the
believing servants reach the didara Let the
serpent swallow Tamu Let it extinguish
Tamu, what is that to you?

Wherever I call, Hak is ready for it. You
always suppress it on the plain, who is what?
What is this to you, do not burn your
servants?"

Yen continues the same Kaygusuz "*acama2*" questioning:

"I have seen the sublime among
the sublime You are the great
God The world recites with the
word
You read syllable God

Thou hast created rebellious
servants, and thou hast put them
there, that they may stand still,
and thou art there, and thou art at
the end, O God.

You have created a bridge made
of hair, so that servants may
pass over it Let us stand like
this If you are valiant, you pass
over, O God"

B
THE "ADVENTURE" OF THE MIND

"Don't pay any attention to their concrete beauties,
conscience is hidden in our body.
Sometimes a heartache, sometimes a lump in the throat,
sometimes specific as a whining nose, sometimes as a bent waist:"*0

The ability to think *is called "reason"*: What humanity has created through its social action is the ability to "drop".

In the process of humanisation, the "*hand*", which became free to act by "*moving away*" from the footstool, was a product of labour; the interaction of hand-labour, that is, *the "hand-labour dialectic"*, developed labour and created "*cooperation and sociality*". Co-operation and sociality brought people to the state of having something to tell each other and created "language".

In this process of formation lasting hundreds of thousands of years, *the "hand-labour-language dialectic"* brought forth a "*human mind*" from an animal brain.

The logical sequence of rational judgements is *called "reasoning"*.

60. Karakaşlı Karin; Elini Koyduğun Yer; Radikal İki; 27.05.2012;

S.:2

is called. Deduce unknown propositions from known propositions-reasoning. Logic is the science of this reasoning.

Reasoning is done by "*deduction and induction*". Therefore, reason is also defined as "*the ability to reason*".

For example, the French thinker Descartes founded his philosophy with "*reasoning*": According to him, a thought was formed by a previous thought; therefore, one could arrive at the "*truth*" by meticulously following the sequence, *without "confusing"* a "Jdf211P thought" between the chain of thoughts formed by reasoning.

Reasoning, by gaining new knowledge, formed higher forms of the process of knowledge such as "*syllogism*" and "*varsd Jlm*". The German thinker Hegel despised reasoning; he *called it "key-f* defines reasoning as "*drawing arbitrary conclusions from the subject matter and propositions*". He replaces reasoning with the "*dialectical method*". According to him, inference *should* not be arbitrary and random, but "*certain and necessary*", and this could only be achieved by the "*dialectical method*".

Spinoza, on the other hand, replaces reasoning with "*geometrical method*": Philosophy could achieve "*definite and necessary results by the geometrical method*", not by random reasoning.⁶¹

61. "It has often been emphasised that one of Spinoza's distinguishing features was his relationship with philosophy, the meaning he attached to it in his life..., in defining philosophy as a 'new principle of life', he went beyond the Cartesian programme... ... in defining philosophy as 'a new principle of life'. It can be recognised from his earliest writings that for Spinoza philosophy was not a mere technical knowledge of nature or a foundation for scientific research. Philosophy is here not a simple process of acquiring knowledge, but an activity that radically transforms the way man lives; it is a difficult but reliable path that leads us 'as if by the hand' to the highest blessedness (...)...In this sense, I feel that philosophy is a preference that comes at the end of a troubled search, a thoroughly thought-out and rousational commitment..." (Spinoza-Blyenbergh; *KötiiJtik Mektupları* (Trans.: Alber Nahum); Norgunk Publishing; İstanbul- 2008; Sunuş; Alber Nahum; p, 9-10)

The conclusion drawn in deductive reasoning is "*certain*", whereas the conclusion drawn in inductive reasoning could be "*either true or false*". In this context, reasoning, in its scientific use, does not give "*arbitrary and random results*". For example, if humans are mortal and Ahmet is a human being, the conclusion that Ahmet will be mortal is certain and necessary.

Understandings and views that assert the unknowability of the universe and deny the human's power of knowing are called "*al-ul-existentialism*". All pre-scientific doctrines, in one aspect or another, had elements of "*non-fluid*".

Since metaphysics and idealism "denied" knowability and knowing altogether, they put forward unscientific terms such as "*belief, intuition, intuition, intuition, objective will, existence, etc.*" instead of scientific knowledge. According to contemporary irrationalism, man is not a conscious being, but a being who acts under the influence of "*unconscious instincts*". Bergsonism, which tries to replace reason with "*intuition*", and

Existentialism, which tries to replace reason with "*being*", are "*contemporary*" examples of irrationality. Meanwhile, all religious doctrines that substitute "*faith*" for reason are also irrational.

Who is it?

Malthusianism, which tries to substitute biological factors for social and economic laws in the explanation of history; Fröydisism and Adlerism, which try to substitute psychic factors, etc., cannot escape "*falling into*" irrationalism. The distinctive characteristic of irrationalism is that it does not consider man as a conscious being, but as a being who behaves under "*unconscious*" influences. is an attempt to show it as if it were a truth.

The doctrine that finds the criterion of truth in rationality is called "*Rationalism*": Although the term "rationalism" has been used in various meanings in the history of philosophy, in essence it is "*intellectualism and metaLism*", because it denies the "*sensory*" aspect of knowledge, but "*absolutises*" its rational aspect; it considers knowledge as the product of "*reason*" only.

In ancient Greek thought, Parmenides, Socrates and Plato were the leading representatives of this understanding: They argued that the truth could only be accessed *through "thought and perception"*. According to them, the objective reality perceived by our senses was nothing but an *"image"*, an *"illusion"*. Reality could only be seen with the *"eye"* of the mind.

In the period following this first definite rationalisation, Des- from Platon

Until Cartes, rationalism was confused with *"Naturalism"*. Naturalists were also rationalists, because they argued that our knowledge *"is present in our minds at the moment of our birth"*. For example, Socrates and Plato, who were considered rationalists, were also Naturalists: According to Socrates, our knowledge was present at birth and could only be revealed and awakened by *"education"*. According to Plato, our knowledge was present at the moment of our birth; what was seen in the world was nothing but *the "vision" of this knowledge present in us*. Humans were initially in the realm of *"idealaZ"* as *"knowledge lcimlik"*; when they came into the world, they brought this existing knowledge with them.

From another point of view, rationality was also confused with *"fiezgfrififr"*. Descartes, who said *"I think, therefore I am"*, relied on *"love"* rather than reason; according to him, the knowledge specific to the qualities of objects is the work of sensations; the knowledge we learn from others is the work of imagination; the knowledge we learn from books is the work of memory. In contrast, divine knowledge was the work of *"reason/ intuition"*.

The German thinker Kant, who is considered a rationalist, was in a sense

He was not a rationalist: Although he argued that our knowledge is innately formed in rational categories, *he did not "deny the role of the senses"* in the process of knowledge, *and* argued that the spontaneous underlying phenomena could neither be perceived by our senses nor known by our reason.

According to the German thinker Leibniz, one of the leading representatives of rationalism, some concepts were already present in our minds at birth, *"before the experiment"*. Experiment gave us neither God, nor the concept of a triangle, nor numbers; all

They would not come to our understanding without "*sense impressions*"; they would "*develop and crystallise*" through sense impressions.

Metaphysical philosophers regard the German thinker Hegel as the pinnacle of rationalism: This is not true, for although Hegel derived objective reality *from "concepts"*, i.e. *from the "rational"*, he was the first philosopher to perceive *the "dialectical unity of the sensible and the perceptual"*.

In the history of philosophy, Fichte was the first sage to place the human "I" at the centre of his system of thought in order to comprehend the universe and the kinds of beings it encompasses, and to seek solutions to all problems from "f'en".

For instance, in Christian heterodoxy and Anatolian Bâtı- nî, the human "f'en" was emphasised a lot, but the subject was viewed from the point of view of faith. Fichte, on the other hand, treated the "I" as an entity outside the realm of belief.

Fichte's approach led to the birth of German idealism. German idealism reached its peak with Hegel: Hegel replaced the "I" with "*spirit*" and sought the solution of all problems of being in the explanation of the "*soul*".

Fichte (1762-1814) laid the foundation of a new view based on the human "I". According to him, there were two different ways of approaching the problems of philosophy:

- 1) To start from the object; there is no possibility of explaining consciousness and finding a definite solution to the problem of consciousness. On the other hand, it cannot be explained that there is a consciousness, a subject in the object. The object is outside the person; by its very existence, it leads the person to "*determinism*" and "*gemkirism*"; it eliminates the freedom of the person; it puts the person under the control of a law that is accepted to exist outside his or her own existence. For these reasons, philosophy cannot begin from the object.

- 2) Starting from consciousness; if philosophy is approached from the point of view of consciousness, the problem of the object will automatically become clear. Because consciousness is not individual but general; all individuals-

"transcendental I" that encompasses all; this "I" is identical with consciousness. In the universe, there is a "finite I" that encompasses all of it and is called *the "First I"*. This I, this transcendental I, is distributed to all individuals; therefore, the "I" found in the individual reflects the "*universal I*"; the individual participates in the "finite I" because of this particular "I" found in himself.

According to Fichte, who uses the concepts of "I" and "*consciousness*" in the same sense, philosophy is "*knowing the general*", and it is this orientation towards the "*general*" that gives philosophy its "*scientific character*".

In Fichte, the individual tries to understand the universe by starting from his own essence, his own "I". In Fichte's dialectic:

a) (*The Thinking I*), the first element is the concept; it is put forward in advance (the thesis); it is the concept of *the "I"* that constitutes the focus of philosophy; the "I" is identical with itself, not with any other object. Since *the "I"* is a thinking entity, it can make itself the subject of thinking. In this case, the thinking "*subject*" and the thought "*object*" become identical.

b) (When thinking of an object, *the "I"* first puts itself forward and then confronts the object it is thinking of; this is the "I" that begins to think and acts by making itself the focus of thinking; for this reason, the "*object*" being thought of becomes the ANTITHESIS.

c) In the last stage, the thinking subject (*I*) and the object considered are handled together and the unity of synthesis (SYNTHESIS) is reached.

In Fichte, there are three successive stages in the formation of knowledge;

1) First stage (THESIS); to grasp the object as a whole within its own reality;

2) Second Stage (ANTITHESIS); comparing the grasped object with other objects and finding the distinction between them;

3) Third Stage (SYNTHESIS); to bring the object together with an object that is not itself and with an object other than itself.

Again, according to Fichte, self-knowledge is realised in different interconnected stages:

a) Wanting and wishing; natural needs are evident; the person is not free because he is under the influence of nature;

b) The tendency to be sovereign; the person begins to exercise sovereignty over beings other than himself;

c) The will to freedom; respect and love for others; limiting one's own freedom in favour of the freedom of others, self-sacrifice, etc.

The German philosopher Hegel⁶² defined the types of being as "*certain stages of the soul*".

62. "To elucidate this issue, Jaspers divides Western intellectual history into two periods: One, characterised by the dominance of the logos and the warning 'Know Thyself', culminating in Hegel; the other, characterised by the profound disillusionment of reason's self-confidence, the dissolution of all boundaries, the collapse of all authority, beginning with Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. With their claims that human knowledge is nothing but interpretation, with their seductive desire for disguise and masks, and with their dizzying call for a truth that constantly questions itself, they represent 'modernity somersaulting on itself'... Jaspers labelled Nietzsche, along with Marx and Kierkegaard, as one of the three thinkers who no longer assumed the 'absolute claims' in the tradition of Western thought. These thinkers are open to criticism in terms of what they foresee, but extraordinary in terms of the position of uneasiness they place us in: 'They stand at the gateway to modern thought. They did not show the right way, but they enlightened in a unique way.'" (Behler Ernst; *Ynminci Yiizyilda Nietzsche* (Trans. Kemal Atakay); Cogito; Üç Aylık Düşünce Dergisi; Yapı Kredi Yayınları; İstanbul- 2001; Sayı: 25; s. 41-42)

"that it consists of the transformation that emerges in the field of vision"

He brought German idealism to its peak by defending his view.

Hegel's philosophy had three main subjects:

- 1) Logic, which dealt with the creation of the universe and the existence of God as a problem of ontology;
- 2) The philosophy of nature dealt with the spiritual unfolding of the divine being in the material universe;
- 3) Philosophy of the soul; in the human soul, from the event of creation

tried to explain the return to God that had originated.

Hegel attempted to explain these three subjects with a method based on the thesis-antithesis-antithesis-argument; starting from the judgement that *"the basis of philosophy is the act of imagination"*, Hegel concluded that the source of truth *could be reached "not by experiment or experimental data, but by pure imagination"*. Because, he says, *"Philosophy is the observation of the object by thought"*. According to him, the *"object"* is a rational being like the *"subject"*. Thinking based on the principles of reason in philosophy is to give a *"constructive and creative"* quality to the whole system of concepts. Thinking derives concepts from one another in a regular and continuous development; it creates a *"set of concepts"*; the final stage of this constitutive development is the concept of *"universe"*, which gathers all concepts in itself.

Hegel, after describing *"thinking and development"* as two basic actions that require each other, clarifies the problem of method. He argues that there is a universally valid basic principle in this regard and calls this basic principle, which constitutes the essence of method, *"dialectics"*.

In Hegel, there are three elements that constitute the essence of the dialectical method;

- 1) Existence (thesis);
- 2) Absence (ANTITHESIS) and

3) Becoming (SYNTHESIS).

According to Hegel, existence, like thought, was a continuously developing and progressive process in accordance with the "*dialectical method*". At the basis of this development, there was a self-transcending principle such as "*idea, spirit, essence, essence*", depending on the form of the solution of the question. The "*Idea*" led to the emergence of different fields such as "*universe, being, becoming*". As the "*Idea*" entered the process of development towards its goal, a three-stage "*unfolding, development*" environment was born in accordance with the "*dialectical method*":

1) In the first stage, the soul or the idea is within itself; it is limited to itself; it is an entity by itself; it is a "*field of things*" because the hidden power in its essence has not been realised.

2) The second stage is the realisation of the soul or idea in order for it to know itself, to grasp the integrity of its own essence. It is the soul's creation of nature by overflowing out of its own essence in order to realise itself. The soul or idea, which does not form nature, has moved away from its own essence, has become alienated from itself, and has acquired a quality contrary to its essence. In other words, the soul contradicts itself. The only law valid at this stage is "*necessity*".

3) In the third stage, in order to get rid of this contradiction, the soul enters a new opening; it tries to return to itself, to reach "*unity*" in the "*universe of culture*", which is its own product. This attainment is realised as a result of its union with the nature from which it is alienated. The soul finds itself, attains its freedom, becomes conscious of itself. The only law valid at this stage is "*freedom*"⁶³

63. "Modern freedom is the enemy of reason because reason reduces it to its function as an instrument of power in the process of conquest of nature and subjugation of others..." (Eagleton, Terry; *Sweet Violence: The Tragic Concept*. Translation: Kutlu Tunca-; istanbul- 2012; Page: 287)

With these three stages, which come to life as a result of the unfolding of the soul, three spheres of existence are formed:

a) The first sphere of existence, realised through the unfolding of the first stage, is the sphere of "*independent objects*", the subject of logic and mathematics; these "*beings*", which have nothing to do with matter, with the creations of human consciousness, are infinite, without any prior existence; they develop spontaneously, outside the influence of human beings. The thinking human being can only reveal them, not create them. There is a spontaneously established proportion and order among these unchanging, self-identical beings.

b) The second sphere of existence gains reality with the unfolding of the second stage; this sphere of existence is "*nature*"; the soul, by alienating itself, has enabled the birth of the environment that realises "*becoming*"; therefore, nature is a "*space of becoming*". In nature, an object exists only because of another object; there is no spontaneity. "*Necessity*" is valid in this field where the soul lacks freedom and consciousness. Even so, nature is never irrational; on the contrary, it is rational.

c) The third sphere of existence gains reality with the opening of the third stage. It is the soul's reaching a "*synthesis*" that will get rid of its self-contradictory situation; it is the soul's attainment of integrity in accordance with its own essence by getting rid of nature. This space is a "*cultural universe*" in the sense of the environment in which man, as a thinking, creating being, takes place. In this environment, the soul first begins to awaken in a single person/individual; then it becomes self-conscious in society, the sphere of existence in which the individual exists. By realising this, the soul is freed from nature and transformed into "*unity*" and "*wholeness*" by eliminating the contradictory situation with "*synthesis*",

It remains an "I" that is "identical" with itself in objective multiplicity. The main characteristic of this spiritual sphere of being, which is situated in space and time, is that it "does not resemble *the East*"; here human consciousness is not in space and time, but space and time are in human consciousness. On the other hand, the second sphere of being, nature, is entirely in space and time.

The German thinker Feuerbach (1804-1872) contributed to the formation of Marxist philosophy by criticising Hegelian idealism based on "*oriental sciences*".

Feuerbach tried to develop a "new philosophy" based on anthropology and physiology, which would establish the foundations of a naturalistic-insane morality. He attempted to criticise the thought originating from Hegel: Hegel both defended the primordially of the understanding (intelligence) and said that the intellect (reason) must realise itself in matter. While defending the rationality of reality and the reality of rationality, he raised reason to the level of "*absolute essence*". In order to explain the reality of a world based on space and time, he argued that matter is "*the negation of thought* and that *thought* cannot realise *itself in matter*".

Feuerbach, taking up Hegel's approach, argued that idealism was in fact "euphemistically" true and that reality and sensation were "*identical*". However, Hegel did not want to "bury" this fact in order to explain the sensible world in terms of an absolute being equipped with human self, consciousness and reason.

In Feuerbach's philosophy "*alienation*" occupied an important place; it was seen as the result of the "*special sciences*" of social organisation. According to him, the root of alienation lay in the "*institutions of religion*". "*Myths*", symbolising the divine power, were nothing but ways in which man "*reflected his humanity outside himself*".

God was therefore "*the outward expression of human nature*".

By attributing his own characteristics to a supernatural "*töu*" through religion, man *had become* "two/fused and *alienated*". The reason for this was the sense of "*dependence*" that man felt in the face of the "blind" forces of nature and society. In order to get rid of this alienation, it was necessary to develop a "*religion*" not about God, but about human beings.

Again, according to him, only a being *that could be "sensed"* was a real being; the basis of philosophy was not "*reason and abstraction*" but human "*sensibility and emotions*"; the subject of thought was being; the essence of being as being was the essence of nature. Feuerbach;

- a) In contrast to materialism, consciousness and understanding (intelligence),
recognises a structure based on ontology and epistemology
- b) In contrast to idealism, it regards matter as real;
- c) It deifies neither consciousness nor matter.

According to him, man differs from nature not only *by his "consciousness"* as the materialists say, but also by his ability to undergo "*rational change*" as a being capable of opening to consciousness. For this reason, it is "*wrong*" to try to "*separate*" the material and spiritual nature of man in order to understand his essence.

The "task" of philosophy is to deal with man as a conscious being who tries to understand his own essence in relation to nature and other beings of his kind.

Feuerbach defines himself as a "*materialist*"; with this he thinks of man as "*an abstract individual, a biological being*". He sees philosophy as "*the transformation of theology into anthropology*". Man, created by natural processes, "reveals" his passions such as the feeling of love and the desire for unity through his attitude towards the world. All human thought and action is the desire to create a society with "*common emotional content*".

The assumptions of metaphysical philosophers about the source of knowledge can be categorised under four headings;

- 1) Teachings that assert that our knowledge comes from reason; Rationalism (Rationalism)
- 2) The doctrines that assert that our knowledge comes from our senses; Sensualism (Sensualism);
- 3) Doctrines that assert that our knowledge is innate; Innatism (Innatism-Nativism) and
- 4) Teachings that assert that our knowledge is obtained through our intuition; Intuitionism (Intuitionism-Mysticism).

Rationalism in the theological sense expresses that "*religion is in accordance with reason*"; because, according to one understanding, reason is "God-given".

Rationalism in the real sense, on the other hand, has fulfilled "*progressive functions*" since it expresses confidence in the unlimited possibilities of human reason against the dominance of religion and idealism. Descartes' rationalism is an example of this. In this sense, rationalism is the general name of doctrines that oppose the irrational and irrational. It opposes reason to faith and *denies* all kinds of "*supernatural data*".

Aristotle, in his opposition to Plato's innatist rationalism, argued that "*there is no knowledge*" in our intellect, *that* knowledge is made by our intellect from the elements we "*obtain from our senses and experiments*", that the intellect is not the carrier of knowledge, but the "*maker*" of knowledge, *and that* it takes the material necessary for making knowledge *from the "external world"*. Again, Aristotle divided the intellect into two as "*active intellect and passive instrument*": The passive intellect "*perceives the material material*" obtained through experiments and observations, and the active intellect "*makes knowledge*" from these materials. In a way, this was the meaning of true rationalism.

Alevi Sharia is Enlightenment

"A world in which writers and artists are considered dangerous or unnecessary... A world where mind-taking is almost murder, a world where prostitution is equated with..."

According to the Philosophy of Light or Sudur, man is a "*being of reason*"; his duty is to *achieve "deep reflection"* and to see with the "*heart's eye*". To think deeply, to see with one's heart's eye, could only be realised through introspection, listening to oneself, questioning oneself, in short, observing oneself, which is the proof of "*fiiyilk ânemir*" (âlam-i akbar) and is perceived as "*içtik ânem*".

By fulfilling these, the person would be freed from the "*d'ûnyasa1 desires*" that darken his soul, i.e. his soul, i.e. his consciousness, darken his inner self, and lead him to unhappiness and chaos, and he would learn what the causes of this are, such as ignorance, anger, lust, etc., which are fed by the individual's ego. When he eliminated these passions, he would have attained the "*path of salvation*".

In the Alevi universe of thought, "*existence*" and "*yoMul?*" were two separate states created by one's ability to think. In this context, "*every object exists or no object exists*". Within oneself, there is a universe of "*beliefs and propositions*" that are nourished by thought and derived in a dialectical process. This universe is "*every object*"; according to this universe, "*every object*" exists; this is what is real. This understanding is nothing but a "*different version*" of Platon's "*idea*" doctrine.

64. Tohumcu Aslı; *Ormanın Laneti/ Ray Bradbury; iaLma Zevlci*. (Trans.: Murat Özbank; İthaki Yayınları; İstanbul- 2012); Radikal Kitap; 9 March 2012; p, 12

It is not, and it proves that "existence" is connected with thinking.

On the other hand, there are no objects, because judgements derived from the senses lead to mistakes; they create *the "illusion"* that the visible universe is real, whereas the visible universe is transient; it is not real; that is, *"I do not exist."*⁶⁵

The most powerful factor is *"subtle"*; all *"being-not-being"* is within it; it can be defined by it. Matter, like thought, is a very *"subtle"* force of "light". The assumption that matter is a *"dense, unchanging entity"* is not true. On the contrary, matter is a concentration of *"force"*, i.e. *"energy"*; it is in constant *"flow"*; it is *"a combination of elements and emptiness"*, an objective process measured by "time", which appears as an abstraction of dialectics.

The human body, which is equipped with senses, is also a substance and is in constant change. Since it is a *"part"* of the process that is constantly *"flowing"* with changes and transformations, it has the ability to grasp/understand what is *"flowing"*. For this reason, *"the ability to think"* is the most reliable source. For the human being, who is in a continuous process of movement and change, *"unchanging help, unchanging law"* etc. cannot be in question; accepting such dogmas *"misleads"* the human being,

"prevents" development and maturation.

In spite of all this, the human body is an ever-changing, but *"inadequate"* whole of senses and tissues. Therefore, the body *cannot* lead a person to *"well-being"*.

The body exhibits a structure that has *"harmonised"* with the Earth, that is, the objective world, and is connected and related to it.

On the other hand, the *"soul"* that gives vitality to the body is a *"unity"* formed by temporary and variable emotions, a

65. "Theology is therefore a wager without an object. Darwin ended sanctity in this sense, not only in the case of monkeys." (Eagleton, Terry; *2000 Violence/ Tragic Concept*. Translation: Kutlu Tunca-; İstanbul- 2012; p, 158)

"total", in this sense, is "consciousness", "life". The "I", which creates the soul, consciousness and life and is perceived as the "focus" where identity is concentrated, is a form of expression of this "sum", this "accumulation".

In reality, the soul, consciousness or soul is the "erJr", the "eney?" that passes from one object to another. *"walking to ffakk" is the transition of this power and energy "from one body to another; one object receives the power and energy of another object"*.

It is from this state that man is "y'ar1anma11d1r": To turn towards oneself, which is perceived as the small realm that is the proof of the great realm, is to renew the power and energy of the body by making the small realm the subject of "deep contemplation". It is to find the opportunity to fill the body, which is a substance, with a new power and energy, more precisely with consciousness, and to maintain its "vitality" before its power and energy are emptied. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to reach the highest stage of the Four Doors and Forty Makams training, to *"die before dying"*.

In the universe, which consists of a continuous flow of power and energy, *"opposing forces"* are sovereign. All events depend on the relations of these opposing forces; *the "beginning" of one event is the "end" of another*.

In this context, the Alevi Sharia, which is defined as *"human judgements concerning the objective-social world, i.e. the conclusions of the human mind"*, forms the basis of a *"meta-physical divergence"*.

Because of this understanding, an Alevi-Bektashi, by prioritising thought and reasoning, and by running to the conclusions of his reason, moves himself, society and the universe *"outside the realm of belief"*; he turns himself into an *"end of reî- sefe"*:

a) Instead of jumping from reason to faith and locking their minds with their beliefs; on the contrary, they jump from faith to reason and sanctify their beliefs with reason; they nourish their own metaphysics to the extent their reason allows.

b) Every day, the objective limits of their world become more and more limited.

On the contrary, by pushing the limits of metaphysical enlightenment, they continuously expand the objective boundaries of their world; they step into the social space drawn by labour as the bearer of a contemporary thought/attitude; they meet progressive social forces on the ground of reason and community organisation, on the opposite side of the state and the dominant fire.⁶⁶

66. "': For 'the thought of the flesh is enmity against God', ... 'it does not, and cannot, obey God's law.' Therefore, those who are in favour of the carnal will and must continue to be enemies of God." (Anidjar Gil; *The Enemy's TaElûf Jew*, Arab. (Trans.: Timu- china Binder); Ayrinu Publications; İstanbul- 2012; p, 43)

THE "ADVENTURE" OF THE FUTURE-CUSTOM

"Life is more fun if you play games."⁶⁷

Deep-rooted habits that come from the past and bind the members of a society to each other are *called "tradition"*, while unsanctioned habits based on custom are called "custom". Tradition and custom are two important phenomena in social life. Traditions and customs constitute "*custom*". In this context, custom can be defined as the rules of behaviour that regulate the way people live. These social habits are formed by various influences such as economic activity, beliefs, natural conditions, etc.⁶⁸

67. The Essence of *the Word* by *Roald Daki*; Cumhuriyet Kitap; 27 September 2012; Issue: 1180; p, 6

68. "The past never stands still and waits to be rediscovered, to be recognised exactly as it is. History always establishes the relationship between a certain present and its past. This means that fear of the present leads to blurring the past. The past is not something to live in. It is a well of results from which we draw things out when we act. The cultural contamination of the past leads to a twofold loss. First, works of art are pushed back too far. Then we are left with fewer results from the past that need to be completed in action." (Berger, John; *-from the BBC television series- Görme Bilimleri* (Trans.: Yurdanur Salman); Metis Publications; Ninth Edition; İstanbul, 2003; p, 11)

There are customs that have become dogmas, i.e. "*regressive*", and those that are key to the development of society, i.e. "*progressive*".

Some sociologists, such as the Russian-born US sociologist Pitirim Sorokin (1889-1968), who is known for his distinction of socio-cultural systems into sensory and design systems, have developed a "*social science of custom*", arguing that social development is driven by customary reasons. According to him, neither future wars could be prevented nor a new order could be established without a radical "*self-sacrifice*" of individuals, society, social institutions and culture, i.e. without a tendency to make every sacrifice for the good of others. "*Love*", which was perceived as the "*ceremonial resurrection*" of the respect for life, was the most urgent question of humanity today, "*much more urgent*" than any scientific, technological or other kind of development and progress. According to Sorokin, who stated that the post-medieval sensuous Western culture was in its final stages and that "*love*", which was not sexual in nature, should be analysed as a science in order to save it from worldwide turmoil, the solution to almost everything depended on the revival of the "*spirit of ceremonial altruism*".

The French sociologist Lucien Levy-Bruhl (1857-1939), who interpreted custom as a science and opposed it to customology, followed Durckheim's method in sociology. According to him, primitive man did not recognise the "*law of f-/working*", his "*way of separating*" the natural from the supernatural, and his way of thinking were therefore "*primitive*". The aim of the science of customs was to describe the customs of various nations in various ages, to analyse the "*evolution*" of these customs and to find their "*laws*". Therefore, the new science of ethics, which was to replace this ethics, was to be a "*science of customs and traditions*". Levy-Bruhl followed a "*factualist*" method, and developed a theoretical He argued for the "*impossibility*" of theology. According to him, the theory-

There was not and could not be a theoretical morality. Because theoretical morality had the *"contradiction"* of being a *"practical philosophy"*; in morality, it was impossible to *"separate"* the theoretical from the practical; even when morality wanted to be theoretical, it could not avoid being practical. In this context, all sciences were theoretical in the beginning; after they realised knowing and learning and developed them to the extent that they were suitable for practice, they turned to *"practice"*.

Morality, on the other hand, required both *"knowing"* and *"doing"*; from the point of view of logic, such a thing was both *"difficult"* and *"impossible"*. In essence, theoretical morality was also *"authorless"*. For, although various doctrines of morality *"clashed"* with each other in the theoretical field, in practice they were *"united"* with each other, putting forward almost *"separate"* duties and giving the *"same"* commandments. In other words, the *"evolution"* of traditions and customs in the historical process has continued independently of theoretical morality. Therefore, it was necessary to find the *"laws"* of these customs and traditions and to put forward the *"science of customs"*, leaving theoretical morality, i.e. ethics, aside. Moral life was full of *"conflicts"* between various duties that were unpredictable and could not be theorised. Theoretical morality could not grasp this living reality of life.

These arguments of Levy-Bruhl were supported by another French sociolinguist Georges Gurvitch (1894-1965). According to Gurvitch, who tried to develop sociology on a more solid ground and argued that *"dialectical"* relations should be established between it and philosophy, theoretical morality, i.e. ethics, was *"possible"*, but it should not make any *"rules"* or put forward any *"rules"*; it should only make theoretical *"judgements"* and should give up conflicting with ethics and *become* a kind of *"assistant"* to it. Again, according to him, the duties of the science of customs could be listed as follows:

- 1) It must meticulously separate moral phenomena from other social phenomena, especially from phenomena such as religion and law.
- 2) It must make a concrete description of the positive contents of each of the unlimited varieties of moral experience.
- 3) It must define moral phenomena within the totality of social phenomena.

After these unscientific arguments, let us now get to know "ethics", or "*moral science*" more closely: The science that defines and rules good behaviour and bad behaviour for a specific place and time is called "*tömbi-*". Determined by social-economic formation "*morality*" is a "*historical phenomenon*".

The history of ethics begins with a personal and subjective ethics based on "*individual conscience*", i.e. "*morality*"; it then turns into a form of "*social consciousness*" that directs, and sometimes guides, the attitudes that people have to follow towards each other and towards social events. This objective and general practical ethics, which emerged in the primitive communal social order, is called "*custom and tradition*". In the following process, "*ethics*" is formed as a "*theoretical theology*" that analyses the essence and source of morality, customs and traditions. "*Ethics*", which is called ethics, is initially "synonymous" with the term philosophy; therefore, to philosophise is to do ethics.

This kind of philosophical understanding of ethics was carried to its extreme in Socrates (470-399 BC).

Socrates is better known as the "*founder*" of moral philosophy. Socrates endeavours to show the consciousness of individuals what their essence is. According to him, no one could be bad "*on purpose*". The fact that people went "*outside*" the moral standards was basically the result of "*wrong*" knowledge; therefore, every person who learnt the "right things" would be good whether he or she wanted to be or not.

In the Middle Ages, theology was transformed into *"theology"* or *"religious theology"*. Here, the source of theology was measured by *"conformity"* or *"non-conformity"* to the will of God. Submission, non-resistance to suffering and evil, endurance of everything, resignation to fate were divine *"virtues"*.

The first doctrine to explain ethics in a real sense was *"dialectical and historical materialism"*: Earlier theories of ethics *had been "idealistic and materialistic"*, according to which social *"disorder"* could be corrected by putting ethics into practice. Many theories of theology were formed in this channel: For example, the English thinker Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), one of the first proponents of the theory of evolution, who argued for the *"primacy"* of the individual over society and science over religion, developed the theory of *"evolutionary ethics"*. Reducing theology to *"life science"*, Spencer evaluated good and evil in terms of their conformity and incompatibility with the evolutionary process; in other words, people's morality was determined by their *"attitudes"* in the face of natural phenomena. Spencer's doctrine was *"unscientific"* because it had the *"fallacy of conflating ethics with life science"*.

The theory of *"moral relativism"* put forward by A. J. Ayer (1910-1989), one of the pioneers of analytical philosophy and one of the developers of logical phenomenology, and R. Carnap (1891-1970), who made important contributions to logic, language analysis, probability theory and philosophy of science, argued that moral judgements are *"relative"* and that it cannot be said that any behaviour is good or bad in terms of *"logic"*. This conception was *"unscientific"* because it exaggerated the *"puzzling"* aspects of moral judgements, and because it had the idea of *"eliminating immorality through logic"*.

The German philosopher H. Cohen (1842-1924), one of the most important proponents of Neo-Newmanianism, who developed the theory of moralistic socialism, P. Natorp (1854-1924), one of the main representatives of the Neo-Newmanian School, and the German legal philosopher R.

Stammler, a German philosopher of law, reduced "*socialism*" to Kantian theology and argued that social contradictions *could be "harmonised"* with theology. This approach was also "*unscientific*" in the sense that it *ignored* scientificity.

"*Autonomous theology*", which was developed by some thinkers in opposition to the "*autonomous theology*", tried to explain the theology with reasons that were completely "*independent*" from subjective wills such as state laws and religious commandments. This understanding "*ignores*" the effectiveness of the subject in society, "*öil/m i::bş i::bş i::b*".

The Swiss theologian K. Barth (1886-1968) and the French The "*theology of ratification*", put forward by thinkers such as the sociologist L. Levy-Bruhl, evaluated the theological rules according to whether they were "*ratified*" or not; it divided them into three branches according to the one who made the ratification:

- a) The theology of theological affirmation;
- b) The theology of psychological consent;
- c) The science of social consent.

This understanding denies the "*objective criterion*" of theology. "*unscientific*".

For the first time in the second half of the XIXth century, the doctrine of "*dialectical and historical materialism*" analysed and unambiguously demonstrated that morality, as a historical phenomenon, was determined by the economic infrastructure of society: It explained that morality is formed "*together*" with society; that its rules are shaped not by laws but by social "*reactions*"; that the sanctions and obligations arising from rules evolve by being determined by "*relations of production*" and that they "*change*" with changes in relations of production. In this context, the rules and obligations of ethics acquired a "*class character*" with the emergence of "*classes*" in slave society. In the following process, "*each class had a code of honour appropriate to its own formation*".

Alevi Sharia is Social Ethics

"Man owes himself to his childhood. " 69

The perception of traditions and customs, which are a collective product, as shari'a emphasises the question of morality as a *"dominant principle"*. In this context, the basis of the Alevi shari'a is formed by *"freeing oneself" from external "conditioning/confusion"* in general and from orthodox Islam, i.e. Sunni shari'a, in particular. In a way, the bâtinî traditions and customs perceived as Alevi Sharia are, in a way, the *"appearance"* of liberation *"against zâfiim"* and *"chicken"* ~~against~~ orthodox Islam.

In this context, freedom is the *sine qua non* *"only condition1"* for *"knowing oneself and being a conscious human being"*. Self-knowledge is a condition of self-knowledge; self-knowledge is a *"human being"* that manifests itself on the basis of belief as an *"attitude and behaviour"* against all kinds of *"births"* that are claimed to come from beyond the object-matter, in this context *"Sunni Sharia"*, and on the basis of thought as an *"attitude and behaviour"* against *"inequality, oppression, injustice and oppression"* in the society in which one lives, and is achieved by *"labouring and living"*. The knowledge of one's own freedom constitutes the ability called *"a?ıJaN"*. Therefore, moral concepts such as *"good and evil"* and *"freedom"* are interconnected. It is *"action"* that enables the emergence of good and evil, and action is *"the activity of freedom"* or the *"continuation of this activity"*. If the activity of freedom is not lacking, the action is *"good"*; if it is lacking, the action is *"evil"*.

Emancipation, on the other hand, derives its source from *the "principles of reason"* Hw: One can be liberated if one's reason is one's guide; by using one's reason, *"liberated from belief"* to think well, say well and do well

69. Parıltı Abidin; *İşyan Ettği Her Şeyeye Taptak Olmakmak* / On the publication of Alexandre Jardin's novel *Küçük Vahşi* (Little Savage); Radikal Kitap; 11 May 2012; p, 4

The most reliable source for self-knowledge is "itself", which is perceived as "Iütik evan" and is the "proof" of the "great universe", i.e. all of nature. In this way he knows himself; the most reliable source for self-knowledge is "himself", which is perceived as the "inner universe" and is the "proof" of the "great universe", that is, of all nature. One's "self" is one's inner universe; for this reason, the most befitting behaviour for human beings is to give importance to the "soul", that is to say, to the "spirit" rather than to the body. Because it is the "effectiveness" and "maturity" of the soul, i.e. the soul, the consciousness, that "protects" the body and "gives it value". A moral person is one whose thoughts and behaviour are in "harmony"; happiness is linked to this "harmony". A person who is a "prisoner" of his passions is a person who does not use his reason properly. cannot be happy; therefore, he becomes unhappy. In order to be happy;

- a) From the pressure of passions;
- b) It is necessary to get rid of temporary and unnecessary tendencies and to act according to the principles of reason.

In reality, both happiness and unhappiness are not related to the body, but to the "soul", that is, to the "living, consciousness". For this reason, it is necessary to keep the soul "free" from the tendencies of the body, to "keep" it in the light of reason. This means "to be reborn with a human personality by passivising the natural personality", to "mould" the desires of the body into a "mould" that will "elevate" the soul, that is, the life, the consciousness.

At this point, the Alevi tradition, which is perceived as "Sharlat", imposes "obligations" on the person, which are recognised as "worship". In the Four Doors and Forty Makams (Four Gates and Forty Makams), these obligations are realised in the form of "**gara eyleme**" (struggle with the nafs). The nafs, which is perceived as a "state of emotion" predisposed to do all kinds of evil, is regarded as the greatest "enemy". Gaza or jihad means "disciplining" oneself, "liberating" oneself from the dogmas of one's belief, which has become independent from one's faith and has become active and dominant.

mest", morality, goodness, evil, humanitarianism, etc. is understood as "individuation" to behave in accordance with the results of reason.

The nafs is the "*spiritual power*" of a being that is perceived as an entity separate from itself, i.e. its soul, its life. There are basically "*seven types*" of it:

- 1) Nafs-i cemadi; the power that holds matter together and prevents it from disintegrating; the material soul.
- 2) Nafs-i nebati; the power that enables reproduction, growth and nourishment; plant spirit,
- 3) Nafs-i animalani; the power that enables movement in living beings; animal spirit.
- 4) Nafs-i humani; the power to comprehend the whole and reason-soul; human spirit.
- 5) Nafs-i natuka; the power that determines man's place among living beings; the human soul.
- 6) Nafs-i holy; the ability to obtain everything possible. The power that possesses the ability; the holy spirit or the spirit of the saints.
- 7) Nafs-i kül; the power that comes after the intellect-i kül, is influenced by it, receives influence from it; the soul of the universe perceived as a human being or the soul of the pole.

In particular, he disciplines the human nafs in "*seven stages*":

- 1) Nafs al-ammara; the state of emotion that compels people to sin, evil and lust; the soul that has never been educated or trained.
- 2) Nafs al-levwamah; the nafs that has been educated, even if a little. matured soul.
- 3) Nafs al-mulhime; the soul that has been educated, but has not matured sufficiently; the soul in which emotional states towards good and evil are experienced together.

- 4) Nafs al-mutmaine; the soul in which emotions towards goodness-truth-beauty are predominant.
- 5) Nafs-i raziye; the soul that welcomes everything that is believed to come from God.
- 6) Nafs-i merziye; the soul that has been tamed and matured and has gained the love of God.
- 7) Nafs-i kâmile; the soul that is fully matured, purified and at the highest stage.

A person who disciplines the nafs stands out with his "decent" behaviour. Decency means *"having a good hand, tongue and hand"* and **avoiding** bad behaviour and actions. Decency, which forms the basis of **Alevi** ethics, is **perceived** as **derived** from the first letters of the words "e/, di/ and bel". "Three things" are important within the scope of decency:

- a) To have a hand: It is a symbol of Alevi pacifism and respect for life in the sense of not stealing or shedding blood. In this way, the hand of an Alevi is transformed from a tool for committing crimes into a tool for creating beauty.
- b) To hold one's tongue: It is a symbol of Alevi openness in the sense of not lying and not thinking of people with words. In this way, an Alevi transforms his/her tongue from being a means of gossiping and participating in mischief and sedition into a means of telling the truth and creating beauty of speech.
- c) Possession of the waist: Possessing one's nafs is a symbol of abstaining from illegitimate relationships in the sense of not committing adultery. In this way, an Ale- vi transforms the sexual organs from being a means of fornication into a means of creating the beauty of living together with one's spouse or lover.

On the other hand, an Alevi must fulfil the obligations that being "*decent*" imposes on him/her; he/she must devote himself/herself to the happiness of human beings and be ready to endure all kinds of sacrifices for this purpose. In this context, when an Alevi is educated, he/she must put all kinds of gains and achievements into the service of the individual and then to the service of the society beyond the objective limits of the individual; in other words, he/she must be a servant of the individual-society. Because this is the purpose of human education. This is also a "*worship*", "*sharing the self-sacrifice*" that must be shown to achieve happiness and happiness on the grounds of being in the service of the individual and society.

In order to attain happiness, a person must fulfil the obligations created by the conclusions he reaches with his reason through "self-sacrifice". Self-sacrifice is a form of "*behaviour*" and is related to spiritual life. Its aim is the happiness of the individual, and beyond the individual, the happiness of society and humanity. In other words, it is necessary to put into practice qualities such as truthfulness, loyalty, keeping one's word, benevolence, and freedom from passions, which stem from self-sacrifice. Due to these conditions, it can be said that the Alevi way of life-belief, which is structured on tradition and custom, which is a "*collective product*", has the quality of "*a social leadership organised according to the moral principles of the people.*"⁷⁰

70. "One of the most fascinating aspects of Dumézil's work is this game of corner-catching between the world of gods and the world of men, between the mythological universe and the historical universe: The trace of a usurper in history is being traced, and then the mask of a counterfeiting god is being unmasked!" (Dum'izil Georges; *Myth and Epic I/ The Ideology of the Three Isjevs in the Epics of Indo-European Peoples* (Trans.: Ali Berktaş); Yapı Kredi Ya- yınları; İstanbul- 2012; pp. 21-22; Introduction/ Üç Vamuş Üç Yokmuş. Joel H. Grisward-)

BERSERKER
BOOKS

